- 1 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: OKAY. WE'LL COME
- 2 BACK TO ORDER FOR THE AFTERNOON SESSION OF THE
- 3 NOVEMBER BOARD MEETING OF THE CALIFORNIA

INTEGRATED

- 4 WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD. DO -- I'LL START HERE WITH
 - 5 MR. RELIS. ANY EX PARTES?
 - 6 BOARD MEMBER RELIS: YES, I HAD A BRIEF
 - 7 CHAT WITH TERRY LEVEILLE REGARDING THE POLICY

ON

- 8 PARTIES WHO HAVE NOT PERFORMED HISTORICALLY WITH
- 9 THE BOARD.
- 10 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: OKAY. MR.

JONES.

- BOARD MEMBER JONES: ALL MINE WERE HELLOS,
- ONE TO BUD PORTER, ONE TO JOE MINNER, ONE TO THE
- 13 FOLKS EACH FROM THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO, AND I
- 14 PROBABLY SAID HI TO CUPPS TOO. I THINK THAT WAS
- 15 IT.
- BOARD MEMBER RELIS: I DID SAY HI TO

CUPPS

17 AS WELL.

18	CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: I DID THAT TOO.
I	
19	DON'T REALLY HAVE ANYTHING TO WAIT A MINUTE.
20	BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: I HAD THE SAME
21	CONVERSATION WITH TERRY LEVEILLE, AND I
PRESUM	Е.
22	AND ALSO, JANET AND I HAD A CONVERSATION WITH
23	GEORGE LARSON AND HIS CLIENT REGARDING THE
24	BOARD MEMBER GOTCH: JOEY TONEY, I
THINK,	
25	IS HIS NAME.

139

- 1 BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: REGARDING THE
- 2 CALAVERAS WHATEVER IT IS.
- BOARD MEMBER FRAZEE: YES, I SPOKE

WITH

4 CLINT WHITNEY REGARDING ITEM 25, THE CITY OF

SAN

5 DIEGO'S LEA PROPOSAL, AND BRIEFLY WITH JOHN

CUPPS

6 REGARDING TIRE CHIPPING AT CHICAGO GRADE

LANDFILL.

- 7 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: OKAY. THANK YOU.
- NOW WE'LL MOVE TO ITEM 25,
- 9 CONSIDERATION OF TEMPORARY CERTIFICATION AND
- 10 DESIGNATION OF THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO DEVELOPMENT
- 11 SERVICES DEPARTMENT AS THE LOCAL ENFORCEMENT

AGENCY

- 12 FOR THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO. DOROTHY RICE.
- MS. RICE: THANK YOU, MR. CHAIRMAN AND
- 14 MEMBERS. TOM UNSELL AND CHRISTINE MCCRACKEN

WILL

- 15 PRESENT THIS ITEM.
- 16 MR. UNSELL: MR. CHAIRMAN AND BOARD
- 17 MEMBERS, THIS ITEM COMES BEFORE YOU FOR

CONSID	ERA-
18	TION OF TEMPORARY CERTIFICATION AND DESIGNATION
OF	
19	THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
20	DEPARTMENT AS THE LOCAL ENFORCEMENT AGENCY FOR
THE	
21	CITY OF SAN DIEGO. THIS IS A RESULT OF THE
CITY	
22	EXERCISING THE STATUTORY OPTION TO AT ANY SUCH
TIME	
23	A CITY MAY CHOOSE ESTABLISH THEIR OWN LOCAL
24	ENFORCEMENT AGENCY.
25	THE CITY WITHDREW THE DESIGNATION
OF	

140

1 THE COUNTY AS THEIR LOCAL ENFORCEMENT AGENCY MID

TO

2 LATE SUMMER. THEY NOTIFIED US IN WRITING GIVING

US

- 3 THE NECESSARY MANDATED 90 DAYS ADVANCE NOTICE OF
- 4 THE WITHDRAWAL OF THAT. EFFECTIVE DATE OF

WITH-

- 5 DRAWAL OF DESIGNATION IS TODAY, THE 19TH OF
- 6 NOVEMBER, AS A RESULT.
- 7 AS I MENTIONED, THE DEVELOPMENT
- 8 SERVICES DEPARTMENT IS THE LEA FOR THE CITY OF

SAN

9 DIEGO, RESIDES UNDER THE CITY MANAGER. THE

TITLE

- 10 14 REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS CONSIDERS THE OPTION
- 11 THAT THE BOARD CAN ISSUE TEMPORARY

CERTIFICATION

12 FOR SPECIFIC TIME PERIODS. CONSISTENT WITH

PAST

13 PRACTICES, THIS IS BEING BROUGHT FOR YOU WITH

THAT

14 RECOMMENDATION FOR TEMPORARY CERTIFICATION

WHERE

15 THE AGENCY OR THE LEA WILL NOT OR WILL BE

RESIDING

- 16 HAS NOT EXERCISED PUBLIC HEALTH ENFORCEMENT ACTIONS
- 17 IN THE PAST. AND THAT'S CONSISTENT WITH OUR PAST
- 18 CERTIFICATION PRACTICES.
- 19 AT THIS POINT I'LL TURN IT OVER TO
- 20 CHRISTINE, AND SHE'LL GIVE YOU A BRIEF UPDATE

ON

THE ENFORCEMENT PROGRAM PLAN AND THE

DESIGNATION

- 22 INFORMATION PACKET PROVIDED BY THE CITY.
- MS. MCCRACKEN: GOOD AFTERNOON. AS

TOM

24 STATED, THE PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE ALLOWS

LOCAL

25 GOVERNING BODIES TO DESIGNATE AN ENFORCEMENT

AGENCY

- 1 TO CARRY OUT SOLID WASTE PERMITTING, INSPECTION,
- 2 AND ENFORCEMENT DUTIES IN THEIR JURISDICTION.
- 3 REGULATIONS REQUIRE DESIGNATED LOCAL AGENCY
- 4 DEVELOP, SUBMIT FOR BOARD APPROVAL, AND ADOPT AN
- 5 ENFORCEMENT PROGRAM PLAN. THE EPP NEEDS TO
- 6 DEMONSTRATE THAT THE LEA MEETS ALL OF THE REQUIRE-
 - 7 MENTS FOR CERTIFICATION.
- 8 AS OF AUGUST 1ST, 1992, THE BOARD

CAN

- 9 APPROVE A DESIGNATION IF IT FINDS THAT THE
- 10 DESIGNATED ENFORCEMENT AGENCY IS CAPABLE

OF

11 FULFILLING ITS RESPONSIBILITIES UNDER

THE

- 12 ENFORCEMENT PROGRAM AND MEETS THE CERTIFICATION
- 13 REQUIREMENTS ADOPTED BY THE BOARD.
- 14 FOR A LOCAL AGENCY TO BE CERTIFIED

BY

THE BOARD, THEY MUST HAVE THE FOLLOWING:

TECHNICAL

- 16 EXPERTISE, ADEQUATE STAFF RESOURCES, ADEQUATE
- 17 BUDGET RESOURCES, ADEQUATE TRAINING, THE

EXISTENCE

- 18 OF AT LEAST ONE PERMITTED SOLID WASTE FACILITY
- 19 WITHIN THE JURISDICTION, NO OPERATIONAL

INVOLVEMENT

- 20 IN ANY OF THE TYPES OF FACILITIES OR SITES IT
- PERMITS, INSPECTS, OR ENFORCES, AND THEY MUST BE
- THE SOLE ENFORCEMENT AGENCY FOR THAT
- JURISDICTION.
- THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO HAS

REQUESTED

- 24 ALL FOUR TYPES OF CERTIFICATION. BOARD STAFF
- HAS
- 25 REVIEWED THE DESIGNATION INFORMATION PACKAGE

AND

1 ENFORCEMENT PROGRAM PLAN SUBMITTED BY THE CITY

OF

2 SAN DIEGO DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT AND

HAS

3 FOUND THE DOCUMENTATION MEETS THE REQUIREMENTS

OF

- 4 STATUTE AND REGULATION.
- 5 THERE IS AN INACCURATE STATEMENT

IN

- 6 THE ITEM WHICH READS, "THERE ARE STILL REVISIONS
- 7 BEING MADE TO THE DESIGNATION INFORMATION PACKAGE
- 8 AND THE EPP." PLEASE NOTE ALL THESE SUBMITTALS
- 9 HAVE SINCE BEEN FILED AND ARE COMPLETE.
- 10 WHAT MAKES THIS REQUEST FOR
- 11 CERTIFICATION UNIQUE IS THAT THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO
- 12 PROPOSES TO UTILIZE UNDER CONTRACT A PROGRAM
- 13 MANAGER AND VARIOUS LEA STAFF FROM OTHER

CERTIFIED

14 LEA JURISDICTIONS UNTIL JULY 1ST OF 1997. BY

I'HA'I'	
15	TIME THE CITY INTENDS TO HIRE THEIR OWN PROGRAM
16	MANAGER IN ADDITION TO FILLING AN INSPECTOR AND
17	ENGINEER POSITION. THE CITY HAS FULLY COMMITTED
го	
18	ASSUMING AND PERFORMING ALL DUTIES AND
19	RESPONSIBILITIES OF A CERTIFIED LEA AS OF TODAY
20	WITH THIS STAFFING ARRANGEMENT.
21	THIS CONCLUDES MY PRESENTATION.
AND	
22	TOM WILL NOW PRESENT OUR RECOMMENDATION.
23	MR. UNSELL: THIS ITEM COMES BEFORE YOU
24	WITH A RECOMMENDATION FROM THE PERMITTING AND
25	ENFORCEMENT COMMITTEE TO ADOPT RESOLUTION 97-508

- 1 WITH THE OPTION NO. 1 LISTED IN YOUR BOARD ITEM,
- 2 WHICH IS APPROVE THE EPP, APPROVE THE DESIGNATION,
- 3 AND ISSUE TEMPORARY CERTIFICATION FOR THE JURISDIC-
- 4 TION UNTIL SIX MONTHS AFTER THE HIRING OF PERMANENT
 - 5 STAFF.
 - THIS CONCLUDES OUR PRESENTATION.

ΙF

- 7 YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS, WE'D BE HAPPY TO ADDRESS
- 8 THOSE. I SHOULD NOTE THAT THERE ARE THREE
- 9 REPRESENTATIVES FROM THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO HERE
- 10 TODAY, ELMER HEAP FROM THE SAN DIEGO CITY
- 11 ATTORNEY'S OFFICE, LARRY MONSERRATE OF THE
- 12 DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT WHERE THE LEA

 \mathtt{WILL}

- 13 RESIDE, AND DAVE CAREY, THE LEA PROGRAM MANAGER
- 14 UNDER CONTRACT WITH THE CITY. THIS CONCLUDES

OUR

- 15 PRESENTATION.
- 16 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: QUESTIONS OF

STAFF

- 17 FIRST, OR WOULD YOU LIKE TO HEAR FROM THESE THREE
- 18 GENTLEMAN? LET'S HEAR FROM THEM. OKAY. MR. HEAP.
- MR. HEAP: GRATEFUL TO BE HERE,

CHAIRMAN

- 20 PENNINGTON AND FELLOW BOARD MEMBERS. MY NAME
 IS
- 21 ELMER HEAP. I'M A DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY IN THE CITY
- 22 OF SAN DIEGO CITY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE. WITH ME TODAY
- 23 AGAIN IS LARRY MONSERRATE, WHO'S THE ENVIRONMENTAL
- 24 PROGRAM MANAGER LOCATED IN THE DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
- 25 DEPARTMENT. AND IT'S ALREADY BEEN INDICATED THAT

- 1 THAT'S WHERE THE LEA WILL BE LOCATED. IN ADDITION,
 - 2 DAVID CAREY IS HERE AND HE IS THE PROPOSED LEA
 - 3 PROGRAM MANAGER.
 - 4 I WILL ADDRESS ANY ISSUES THAT YOU
 - 5 MAY HAVE OR QUESTIONS REGARDING THE APPLICATION
 - 6 ITSELF FROM THE LEGAL PERSPECTIVE. IN ADDITION,

Ι

IS

- 7 WANT TO REITERATE, AS IT RELATES TO THE LETTER THAT
- 8 YOU RECEIVED FROM COLEMAN CONRAD, THE DEPUTY CITY
- 9 MANAGER, DATED NOVEMBER 17TH, THAT OUR OFFICE HAS
- 10 ALREADY DESIGNATED WHO THE DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY
- 11 WOULD BE THAT WOULD BE ADVISING THE LEA, AND THAT
- 12 PERSON'S NAME IS PRISCILLA DUGARD, WHO PRESENTLY
- 13 THE CHIEF LEGAL ADVISOR TO THE DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
- 14 DEPARTMENT WHERE THE LEA WILL BE LOCATED.

15	IN ADDITION, OBVIOUSLY MR.
MONSER	RATE
16	IS HERE TO ADDRESS ANY ISSUES THAT YOU MAY HAVE
OR	
17	QUESTIONS REGARDING THIS HOW IMPORTANT IT IS
TO	
18	BE SEPARATED THE DEPARTMENT OF DEVELOPMENT
19	SERVICES TO BE SEPARATED FROM THE
ENVIRO	NMENTAL
20	SERVICES DEPARTMENT WHERE THE OPERATION SIDE
IS	
21	LOCATED WITHIN THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO.
22	MR. MONSERRATE CAN ADDRESS
THOSE	
23	ISSUES, IN ADDITION ADDRESS ANY ISSUES OR
QUESTI	ONS
24	YOU MAY HAVE REGARDING HOW THE DEVELOPMENT
SERVIC	ES
25	WILL INTERACT SPECIFICALLY WITH THE LEA AND

- 1 SPECIFICALLY HOW THE LEA THROUGH THE DEVELOPMENT
- 2 SERVICES DEPARTMENT WILL INTERACT WITH THE CITY
 - 3 MANAGER'S OFFICE.
 - 4 IN ADDITION, OBVIOUSLY, MR.

CAREY

- 5 WILL BE ABLE TO ADDRESS ANY ISSUES REGARDING
- THE
- 6 APPLICATION ITSELF AND WHETHER OR NOT THE CITY
 OF
- 7 SAN DIEGO HAS PUT TOGETHER A PACKET, AN APPLICATION
 - 8 THAT COMPLIES WITH PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE 43200.
- 9 AND I'D JUST LIKE TO MAKE SOME

BRIEF

- 10 REMARKS BECAUSE I BELIEVE THAT IS THE FOCUS,
- OBVIOUSLY, OF THIS HEARING IS TO DETERMINE

WHETHER

- OR NOT THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO HAS COMPLIED WITH
- 13 PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE 43200. HAVE WE PUT A

PROGRAM

14 TOGETHER THAT DEMONSTRATES THAT WE HAVE MET THE 15 REQUIREMENTS AS PROMULGATED IN THE PUBLIC RESOURCES 16 CODE? AND THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO BELIEVES THAT ΙT HAS, THAT IT'S PUT A PROGRAM TOGETHER THAT MEETS 17 18 THOSE STANDARDS. 19 OBVIOUSLY, IT'S THE BOARD'S 20 DETERMINATION TO DETERMINE WHETHER OR NOT WE HAVE 21 MET THOSE STANDARDS AND WHETHER OR NOT THE CITY OF 22 SAN DIEGO UNDERSTANDS WHAT ITS ROLE IS AS AN LEA. 23 I WANT TO REPRESENT FOR THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO THAT WE DO UNDERSTAND THAT ROLE, WE DO KNOW WHAT IT 24 MEANS TO BE AN LEA, AND WE'RE COMMITTED TO BE 25

ΑN

- 1 LEA AND TO BE FAIR AND EQUITABLE IN DEALING WITH
 - 2 ALL SOLID WASTE FACILITY OPERATORS AND OWNERS
- 3 WITHIN THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO, AND WE TAKE

THIS

- 4 RESPONSIBILITY SERIOUSLY.
- 5 AND FINALLY, JUST THE THREE

POINTS I

- 6 WANT TO CONCLUDE WITH, AND THAT IS THIS.

 AGAIN, TO
- 7 REITERATE, WE BELIEVE THE APPLICATION IS CONSISTENT
- 8 WITH THE PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE, THAT WE'VE MET THE
- 9 REQUIREMENTS THERE. IN ADDITION, WE BELIEVE WE'VE
- 10 CREATED AN ORGANIZATION THAT SEPARATES THE LEA AND
- 11 WHERE IT'S GOING TO BE LOCATED IN THE CITY OF SAN
- 12 DIEGO WHERE OPERATIONS SIDE IS IN THE CITY OF SAN

- 13 DIEGO.
- 14 FINALLY, WE BELIEVE PURSUANT TO
- 15 PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE 43214, THAT THIS BOARD

HAS

- 16 INCREDIBLE AUTHORITY TO STEP IN AND TO MONITOR WHAT
- 17 THE LEA DOES WITHIN THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO AND TO BE
- 18 ABLE TO CONDUCT INSPECTIONS AS OFTEN AS YOU DEEM
- 19 APPROPRIATE TO DETERMINE WHETHER OR NOT THE CITY OF
- 20 SAN DIEGO IS MEETING ITS OBLIGATIONS AS THE LOCAL
- 21 ENFORCEMENT AGENCY.
- 22 AT THIS TIME WE ARE OBVIOUSLY

WILLING

- 23 TO ADDRESS ANY QUESTIONS THAT YOU WOULD LIKE TO ASK
- 24 AT THIS TIME.
- 25 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: MR. CHESBRO. 147

1 BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: I THINK I

ALREADY

- 2 KNOW THE ANSWER, BUT THE DEVELOPMENT SERVICES
- 3 DEPARTMENT, COULD YOU JUST DESCRIBE SORT OF

WHAT

- 4 ITS RANGE OF RESPONSIBILITY ARE?
- 5 MR. HEAP: WITH THAT QUESTION, I'M

GOING

- 6 TO TURN IT OVER TO MR. MONSERRATE, AND HE CAN
- 7 ADDRESS THAT QUESTION SPECIFICALLY.
- 8 MR. MONSERRATE: GOOD AFTERNOON,

CHAIRMAN

- 9 PENNINGTON AND MEMBERS OF THE BOARD. MY NAME
- IS
- 10 LARRY MONSERRATE. I'M THE ENVIRONMENTAL

REVIEW

11 MANAGER FOR THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO, AND MY

OFFICE IS

12 LOCATED WITHIN THE DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

DEPARTMENT.

13 OUR MAIN FUNCTION IS TO PROVIDE

LAND

- 14 USE AND REGULATORY AUTHORITY OVER THE CITY'S LAND
- USE DECISIONS. PART OF THAT RESPONSIBILITY,
 OF
- 16 COURSE, IS THE ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW RESPONSIBILITY
- 17 WHICH I PERSONALLY MANAGE. THAT IS AN UNUSUAL
- 18 FUNCTION IN OUR CITY, AS IT IS IN MOST CITIES, IN
- 19 THAT IT'S SEPARATE FROM THE OPERATIONAL ASPECTS OF
- 20 OUR CITY GOVERNMENT.

ENVIRON-

- 21 OFTENTIMES I'M INVOLVED WITH
- 22 MENTAL REVIEW FOR CITY DEPARTMENTS THAT ARE OUTSIDE
- 23 OF OUR DEPARTMENT AND OFTENTIMES IN GREAT CONFLICT
- 24 WITH THEM BECAUSE THE ENVIRONMENTAL OBJECTIVE IS TO
- 25 PROVIDE AN INDEPENDENT ANALYSIS, STEP BACK, PROVIDE

1 DECISION MAKERS WITH INFORMATION WITH REGARDS

TO

2 PROJECT'S IMPACT ON THE ENVIRONMENT. SO THIS

IS

- 3 NOT AN UNUSUAL ROLE AT ALL FOR OUR DEPARTMENT.
 - 4 OUR DIRECTOR, MS. CHRISTIANSON,

IS

- 5 COMMITTED TO PROVIDING THE SAME TYPE OF INDEPENDENT
- 6 REVIEW AND ANALYSIS OF ISSUES RELATING TO THE LEA
 - 7 AS WE DO FOR OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES AS IT
 - 8 RELATES TO OUR CITY.
 - 9 SO THAT'S BASICALLY OUR ROLE,
- 10 DEVELOPMENT AND REVIEW LAND DEVELOPMENT DECISIONS,
- 11 ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW. BE HAPPY TO ANSWER ANY OTHER
- 12 QUESTIONS YOU MIGHT HAVE.
- 13 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: ANY OTHER

QUESTIONS

OF MR. MONSERRATE? OKAY. FINALLY, WE'LL HEAR

FROM	
15	DAVID CAREY.
16	MR. CAREY: MR. CHAIRMAN, MEMBERS OF
THE	
17	BOARD, DAVE CAREY. AS ELMER HAS INDICATED AND
AS	
18	STAFF INDICATED, WE'RE IN FULL SUPPORT OF THE
STAFF	
19	RECOMMENDATION. AND I'LL BE HAPPY TO ANSWER ANY
20	SPECIFIC QUESTIONS YOU MIGHT HAVE WITH REGARD
TO	
21	THE PROGRAM PLAN THAT WE PUT TOGETHER.
22	CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: OKAY. OKAY.
ANY	
23	QUESTIONS OF MR. CAREY? ANY DISCUSSION?
24	BOARD MEMBER JONES: I HAVE SOME
DISCUS	_
25	SION.

- 1 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: MR. JONES.
- 2 BOARD MEMBER JONES: I THINK THAT P&E
- 3 COMMITTEE DID VOTE AFFIRMATIVELY TO PUT THIS
- 4 FORWARD. IT WAS A TWO-TO-ONE VOTE. I WAS THE

ONE

5 DISSENTING VOTE. I DISSENTED FROM THE VOTE FOR

Α

6 VERY SIMPLE REASON. I WORRY SOMETIMES WHEN

WE'RE

7 IN THE PROCESS OF JUST GOING ALONG WITH THE

STATUS

- 8 OUO AS TO WHAT DRIVES A LOT OF THINGS. I THINK
- 9 THAT MR. HEAP MADE IT CLEAR THAT THEY HAD

FILLED

- 10 OUT ALL THE PAPERWORK, PUT EVERYTHING FORWARD.
- 11 I ASKED QUESTIONS, AND I'M GOING

TO

12 TRY TO GO VERY BRIEFLY THROUGH FIVE STEPS. I

DON'T

13 MEAN TO TAKE TOO MUCH TIME WITH THE BOARD, BUT

Ι

- 14 THINK IT IS IMPORTANT TO UNDERSTAND THAT MR.
- 15 CONRAD'S LETTER -- I'M GOING TO START WITH MR.
- 16 CONRAD'S LETTER FROM THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO TO

MR.	
17	CHANDLER WHERE HE IS WITHDRAWING THE WITHDRAWAL
OF	
18	THE LOCAL ENFORCEMENT AGENCY DESIGNATION. THIS
IS	
19	DATED AUGUST 15TH.
20	IN THE SECOND PARA AFTER HE
SAYS	
21	THAT THEY HAD HAD CITY COUNCIL ACTION. HE SAYS
IN	
22	THE SECOND PARAGRAPH, "IT IS IMPORTANT TO NOTE
THAT	
23	THE COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH
24	SERVICES, DEH, SERVED AS AN EXEMPLARY LEA FOR
THE	
25	PAST 12 YEARS. AND THIS CHANGE IN DESIGNATION
IS	150

1	IN	NO	WAY	RELATED	TO	THE	QUALITY	OF	SERVICE
---	----	----	-----	---------	----	-----	---------	----	---------

- 2 PROVIDED BY THAT DEH. TO THE CONTRARY, WE WILL
- 3 SEEK TO HAVE THE DEH CONTINUE TO PROVIDE LEA
- 4 SERVICES ON A CONTRACTUAL BASIS SUBJECT TO

THEIR

- 5 CONCURRENCE FOR AT LEAST THE REMAINDER OF THE
- 6 FISCAL YEAR."
- 7 HE SPEAKS ABOUT THE CONSOLIDATION
- 8 GOING ON WITH MERGERS AND ACQUISITIONS WITHIN

THE

9 WASTE INDUSTRY. "IN SAN DIEGO THAT

CONSOLIDATION

- 10 ILLUSTRATED THE FACT THAT 95 PERCENT OF THE
- 11 COMMERCIAL WASTES ARE COLLECTED BY ONLY FOUR

WASTE

- 12 HAULING COMPANIES COMPARED TO THE SEVEN THAT
- 13 EXISTED IN DECEMBER OF '96. ADDITIONALLY, THE
- 14 COUNTY HAS JUST SIGNED AN AGREEMENT TO SELL

SOLID

15 WASTE DISPOSAL AND TRANSFER SYSTEM TO ALLIED

WASTE

- 16 SYSTEMS, THE SECOND LARGEST WASTE HAULER IN SAN
- 17 DIEGO. AS A RESULT THE CITY COUNCIL DETERMINED

18	THAT IT WAS NO LONGER APPROPRIATE TO DELEGATE
THE	
19	CITY'S LEA RESPONSIBILITIES TO ANOTHER AGENCY
AND	
20	THAT THE CITY MUST TAKE A MORE ACTIVE ROLE IN
THE	
21	MANAGEMENT AND REGULATION OF SOLID WASTE
ACTIVI	TIES
22	WITHIN ITS JURISDICTION.
23	"CURRENTLY THE CITY STAFF AND ITS
24	CONSULTANT, DAVID CAREY, WHO FORMERLY HEADED
THE	
25	COUNTY'S LEA PROGRAM, ARE PREPARING THE
NECESS	SARY

1 DOCUMENTATION AND PROGRAM PLANS FOR THE BOARD

ТО

2 CONSIDER THE CITY'S REQUEST FOR CERTIFICATION

AS

- 3 LEA. BY SEPARATE COVER, WE ARE NOTIFYING THE
- 4 COUNTY AND ITS DEH OF THIS ACTION AND CITY'S

DESIRE

5 TO PROVIDE LEA SERVICES ON A CONTRACTUAL BASIS.

WE

6 ARE ALSO NOTIFYING THEM OF OUR DESIRE THAT NO

NEW

- 7 OR AMENDED SOLID WASTE FACILITIES PERMITS BE ISSUED
- 8 DURING THE INTERIM PERIOD UNTIL THE CITY BECOMES
- 9 THE CERTIFIED LEA WITHOUT CONSULTING WITH OR
- 10 OBTAINING CONCURRENCE OF THE CITY. IF THE

DEH

11 AGREES TO THAT CONDITION, THEN THE CITY

WILL

12 REQUEST THE CHANGE IN DESIGNATION TO BE

EFFECTIVE

13 UPON ITS CERTIFICATION AS LEA. ABSENT AN

AGREEMENT

- ON THIS KEY POINT, KEY POINT THAT NO PERMITS
- BE
- 15 ISSUED AND THAT ANY DECISIONS MADE GO THROUGH
- THE
- 16 CITY MANAGER'S OFFICE, ABSENT THAT AGREEMENT,
- WE'LL
- 17 REQUEST THAT IT BE WITHDRAWN EFFECTIVE UPON
- RECEIPT
- 18 OF THIS LETTER. WE WILL ADVISE YOU OF WHICH
- OF THE
- 19 OPTIONS THE CITY ELECTS IMMEDIATELY AFTER WE
- HAVE
- 20 HAD HAD THE OPPORTUNITY TO DISCUSS THE MATTER
- WITH
- 21 THE COUNTY. TILL APPROPRIATE APPOINTMENTS ARE
- MADE
- 22 AND THE CITY LEA ORGANIZATION BECOMES FULLY
- 23 FUNCTIONAL, WE'LL CONSIDER THIS OFFICE TO BE
- THE
- 24 SINGLE POINT OF CONTACT WITH THE CITY FOR ALL
- 25 MATTERS RELATED TO LEA DESIGNATION AND
- FUNCTION."

- 1 THAT'S FROM THE CITY MANAGER'S OFFICE.
- 2 MR. CHANDLER'S RESPONSE TO THAT,
- 3 DATED SEPTEMBER 4TH, STATES THAT HE RECEIVED

THE

4 LETTER. "I UNDERSTAND FROM YOUR LETTER THAT

YOU

5 DESIRE THE CURRENT LEA NOT TO PROCESS ANY NEW

OR

6 AMENDED SOLID WASTE FACILITIES PERMITS DURING

THE

7 INTERIM CHANGE-OVER OF AUTHORITY UNLESS THE

LEA

- 8 AGREES TO CONSULT WITH YOU AND OBTAIN CITY COUNCIL
- 9 PRIOR CONCURRENCE. I ALSO UNDERSTAND YOUR REQUEST
- 10 THAT SHOULD THE LEA NOT AGREE TO THIS, THE
- 11 WITHDRAWAL OF DESIGNATION WOULD BE

EFFECTIVE

12 IMMEDIATELY. HOWEVER, PLEASE NOTE THAT

THE

CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATIONS, TITLE 14,

SECTION

- 14 18056 SPECIFIES THE METHOD AND TIME FRAMES FOR
- 15 NOTIFICATION OF WITHDRAWAL OF DESIGNATION

BY A

- 16 LOCAL GOVERNING BODY, THUS THE SOONEST THE
- 17 WITHDRAWAL OF A DESIGNATION COULD BECOME

EFFECTIVE

18 IS 90 DAYS FOLLOWING THE NOTICE TO THE

WASTE

- 19 BOARD."
- 20 FURTHER DOWN HE SAYS, "WHILE

I CAN

- 21 UNDERSTAND YOUR REQUESTED DESIRE, THERE IS
- 22 CERTAINLY NO PROVISION IN STATUTE OR

REGULATION TO

23 PREVENT AN LEA FROM CARRYING OUT ITS DUTIES

AND

24 RESPONSIBILITIES AS REQUIRED BY LAW WHILE

THERE IS

25 A CHANGE IN THE LEA ACTIVITY AUTHORITY PENDING.

1 CONVERSELY, THE LEA IS MANDATED TO CONTINUE ТО 2 FULFILL ALL THE DUTIES OF AN LEA UNTIL THE 3 WITHDRAWAL OF DESIGNATION BECOMES EFFECTIVE. 4 "I KNOW THAT YOU WILL UNDERSTAND THE 5 NECESSITY OF THE WASTE BOARD STAFF TO CONTINUE ITS CONSULTATION WITH COUNTY DEH AS LEA FOR MATTERS 6 7 RELATED TO INSPECTIONS, ENFORCEMENT, PERMITTING OF SOLID WASTE FACILITIES AND OPERATIONS IN MATTERS 9 RELATED TO PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY UNTIL A NEW 10 AGENCY FOR THE CITY HAS BEEN DESIGNATED AND 11 CERTIFIED BY THE WASTE BOARD TO ACT AS THE CITY'S 12 LEA. EVERY EFFORT WILL BE MADE TO ENSURE THAT YOU 13 ARE INCLUDED AS POINT OF CONTACT FOR ALL THE CITY

14 MATTERS RELATED TO THESE CONSULTATIONS, AS WELL

AS	
15	THE LEA CERTIFICATION PROCESS. THE WASTE BOARD
16	WILL ACCEPT YOUR NOTICE OF WITHDRAWAL OF THE
17	DESIGNATION OF THE COUNTY TO BE EFFECTIVE
NOVEMB	ER
18	18TH UNLESS WE RECEIVE WORD FROM YOU TO THE
19	CONTRARY."
20	WHEN I FIRST BROUGHT UP THESE
ISSUES	,
21	IT WAS THAT THERE NEEDS TO BE A CLEAR
DELINE.	ATION
22	BETWEEN WHAT THE LEA DOES AND WHAT THE OPERATING
23	STAFF DOES. THIS LETTER WRITTEN BY THE CITY
24	MANAGER OR THE DEPUTY CITY MANAGER NOTIFYING US
25	THAT THEY WERE GOING TO DEDESIGNATE LAYS OUT A 154

- 1 SCENARIO WHERE THEY DON'T WANT THE LEA TO DO
- 2 ANYTHING WITHOUT THEIR PERMISSION. I DON'T

THINK

- 3 THAT THAT IS A SEPARATION OF POWER.
- 4 THE ISSUES THAT I BROUGHT UP AT

THE

- 5 COMMITTEE MEETING WERE DRIVEN BY A COUPLE OF
- 6 THINGS, AND I'LL DO TWO OF THEM REALLY QUICKLY.
- 7 MAY 3D, 1997, FROM THE SAN DIEGO UNION TRIBUNE
- 8 THERE WAS AN ARTICLE THAT STARTED OFF, "THE

COUNTY

9 AND THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO ARE TRASHING EACH

OTHER

10 OVER TRASH IN THE MIDST OF AN UNPRECEDENTED SALE

OF

- 11 COUNTY DUMPS."
- 12 THROUGH THIS ARTICLE THERE'S
- 13 REFERENCES THAT THE CITY WANTS THE SYCAMORE

CANYON

- 14 DUMP, WHICH THE COUNTY PUT UP FOR SALE WITH ITS
- 15 OTHER LANDFILLS. SYCAMORE IS WITHIN THE CITY'S
- 16 JURISDICTION.
- 17 THERE ARE QUOTES FROM PRYOR AND

FROM		
18	THE CITY MANAGER, MCGRORY, THAT SAYS I MEAN	
19	THERE'S A QUOTE HERE FROM LARRY PRYOR THAT HE	
HAD		
20	WRITTEN THAT SAYS, "YOU HAVE ESSENTIALLY"	
THIS		
21	IS A QUOTE IN THAT ARTICLE: "YOU HAVE	
ESSENTIALLY		
22	TOLD POTENTIAL BIDDERS THAT THE CITY HOLDS THE	
LAND		
23	USE APPROVAL KEYS TO THE FUTURE OF SYCAMORE	
24	LANDFILL AND THAT WITHOUT THOSE KEYS, THE	
POTENT	IAL	
25	BIDDERS WOULD BE ACQUIRING AN ASSET WITHOUT MUCH	

155

- 1 VALUE, PRYOR WROTE. YOU HAVE ALSO STATED OR AT
- 2 LEAST INTIMATED THAT THOSE LAND USE APPROVALS

WILL

- 3 BE FAVORABLE IF TITLE TO SYCAMORE IS TURNED OVER
- TO
 - 4 THE CITY FREE OF CHARGE IN 20 YEARS, BUT WILL BE
- 5 UNFAVORABLE SHOULD THE COUNTY OR POTENTIAL

BIDDERS

- 6 NOT MEET THE CITY'S MANDATES."
- 7 THE CITY MANAGER SAID THAT HE HAS,
- 8 YOU KNOW, LEGITIMATE CONCERNS ABOUT A MEGA

LANDFILL

- 9 IN PRIVATE HANDS ON SYCAMORE THAT WOULD HANDLE
- THE
- 10 NORTH COUNTY'S TRASH, POSSIBLY HANDLING GARBAGE
- 11 FROM OUTSIDE THE COUNTY AS WELL.
- 12 SO FROM MAY WE'VE BEEN HEARING

ABOUT

- 13 THIS BATTLE IN THE NEWSPAPERS BETWEEN THE CITY
- AND
- 14 THE COUNTY OVER JURISDICTION OF THIS FACILITY.

NOW

15 WE HAVE AN LEA CERTIFICATION COMING ALONG THAT

MR.	
16	CONRAD WRITES THAT THE LEA FOR SAN DIEGO COUNTY
HAD	
17	DONE EXEMPLARY WORK, BUT YET WE'RE GOING TO
18	DEDESIGNATE HIM AND WE'RE GOING TO CONTROL OUR
OWN.	
19	I ALSO IN THE COMMITTEE MEETING
20	TALKED ABOUT A I HAD HEARD THE COMMITTEE
MINUTE	S
21	OR THE TAPE OF THE COMMITTEE MEETING WHERE THREE
22	ISSUES WERE BROUGHT FORWARD BY THE CITY. ONE
WAS	
23	ON A FRANCHISE MECHANISM, I THINK. ONE WAS ON
A	
24	LAND USE CUP ISSUES FOR I'M PARAPHRASING
THAT.	
25	I'M NOT SURE EXACTLY HOW THAT WORKED AND

THEN

- 1 THE OTHER WAS ON THE LEA DESIGNATION. AND ALL
- 2 THREE WERE HANDLED AS ONE ITEM.
- 3 AND IN EXPLAINING THAT NEED TO

THE

- 4 COUNCIL, THE DISCUSSIONS ABOUT PRIVATE LANDFILLS,
 - 5 THE DISCUSSION ABOUT, YOU KNOW, PROTECTING OUR
 - 6 INTERESTS, THERE IS A QUOTE OR THERE IS PART OF
- 7 THAT TAPE FROM A MRS. KATO OR KETO -- I BLEW IT

THE

- 8 DAY OF THE MEETING. I'M PROBABLY MISPRONOUNCING
- ΙT
- 9 AGAIN -- KEHOE, MS. KEHOE. IT SAID, "SYCAMORE
- 10 MUST STAY IN PUBLIC HANDS. THE LAST THING WE

WANT

- 11 IS THAT LANDFILL TO BE TURNED OVER TO A PRIVATE
- 12 COMPANY BEHOLDEN TO ONLY ITS STOCKHOLDERS TO BE

AT

- 13 THE MERCY OF THAT PRIVATE LANDFILL. THEY COULD
- 14 TAKE TRASH -- TAKE THE TRASH MARKET OUT OF

MIRAMAR

- 15 WHICH WOULD MESS UP LONG-TERM PROJECTIONS. THIS
- 16 COULD BE A VERY SERIOUS, DAMAGING CONDITION TO

THE	
17	CITIZENS OF SAN DIEGO."
18	I THINK THAT'S PRETTY TRUE
19	ASSESSMENT. IF THE WASTE WENT SOMEWHERE ELSE,
IT	
20	MAY BE A PROBLEM. BUT TO USE THE LEA TO ENSURE
21	THAT THAT DOESN'T HAPPEN IS NOT AN APPROPRIATE
USE	
22	OF THE LEA. PRC CODE THAT WAS QUOTED BY MR.
HEAP,	
23	PRC 43200 SAYS THAT THE BOARD SHALL PREPARE AND
24	ADOPT CERTIFICATION REGULATIONS FOR LOCAL
25	ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES. THE REGULATIONS SHALL 157

- 1 SPECIFY REQUIREMENTS THAT THE LOCAL AGENCY SHALL
- 2 MEET BEFORE BEING DESIGNATED AS AN ENFORCEMENT
- 3 AGENCY. THE REGS SHALL INCLUDE BUT ARE NOT

LIMITED

- 4 TO ALL THE FOLLOWING. ONE OF THEM IS TECHNICAL
- 5 EXPERTISE.
- 6 I WILL TELL YOU RIGHT NOW WHEN YOU
- 7 LOOK AT THE PEOPLE THAT ARE LISTED ON THIS
- 8 APPLICATION, THEY HAVE TECHNICAL EXPERTISE.

THAT

- 9 IS NOT A QUESTION OF MINE. ADEQUACY OF STAFF
- 10 RESOURCES IS A QUESTION OF MINE. STAFF RESOURCES,
- 11 THE DAY OF THE MEETING, MR. CAREY AND MR. HEAP MADE
- 12 PRESENTATIONS AS DID LISA WOOD. LISA WOOD
 TALKED
- ABOUT BEING A WORKER BEE AND HIRING PEOPLE, AND

I

- 14 UNDERSTAND SHE'S PROBABLY NOT PART OF THE TEAM
- 15 ANYMORE, BUT THIS PERSON THAT WAS OUT

INTERVIEWING

16 LEA'S OR RECRUITING LEA'S WORKED FOR THE

OPERATOR,

- 17 WORKED FOR ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES, A CLEAR CONFLICT
- 18 OF THAT SEPARATION BETWEEN OPERATION AND
- 19 ENFORCEMENT.
- ONE OF THE OTHER THINGS THAT MR.
- 21 CAREY HAD ALLUDED TO WAS THAT THEY WOULD HAVE

Α

22 FULL-TIME STAFF PERSON ON STAFF. I BELIEVE

IT'S

23 SYLVIA COSTELLO -- CASTILLO, WHO IS A -- GOT

SOME

24 GREAT CREDENTIALS. THIS IS GOING TO BE A FULL-

TIME

25 LEA PERSON THAT -- AND I'M LOOKING BRIEFLY FOR

MY

158

- 1 NOTES -- BUT IS GOING TO -- HAS 15 YEARS EXPERIENCE
- 2 AS AN ENGINEER IN ENGINEER DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION,
- 3 SITE ASSESSMENT, GROUNDWATER ASSESSMENT, LANDFILL
- 4 GAS EMISSIONS AND MITIGATION, MIGRATION CONTROL
- 5 SYSTEMS, RESPONSIBLE FOR THE REMEDIATION AND CLEAN
- 6 CLOSURE OF THE NORTH CHOLOS BURN SITE.

 OVERSIGHT
- 7 OF PROJECTS INCLUDED THE MIRAMAR GENERAL DEVELOP-
- 8 MENT PLAN, MATERIALS RECOVERY FACILITY, HOUSEHOLD
- 9 HAZARDOUS WASTE TREATMENT FACILITY, LANDFILL SITING
- 10 SEARCH, STRONG ADMINISTRATIVE SKILLS, PLANNING,
- 11 BUDGETING, AND PERSONNEL OVERSIGHT. THOSE ARE ALL
- 12 GREAT CREDENTIALS, BUT SHE IS ON LOAN FROM
- 13 ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES. SHE WILL RETURN TO THE
- 14 OPERATOR. OR I INTERPRET WHEN SOMEBODY IS ON

Т	'n	Δ	M	

- 15 THAT MEANS BORROW AND BORROW MEANS RETURN. SO
- ΙF
- 16 THAT'S NOT ACCURATE, THEN THAT'S NOT ACCURATE
- IN
- 17 WHAT WAS DESCRIBED.
- 18 MY OTHER ISSUES WITH THE

RESOURCES,

INDUSTRY

- 19 AND THESE ARE WHAT ARE DRIVING THIS. AND I NEED TO
- 20 SAY SOMETHING BECAUSE I DON'T WANT PEOPLE TO
- 21 MISINTERPRET WHAT I'M TRYING TO DO HERE AS
- 22 TAKING CARE OF INDUSTRY. I GOT PUT ON THIS BOARD
- 23 TO HELP FORM POLICY, AND I THINK I'VE GOT A PRETTY
- 24 CONSISTENT RECORD OF TRYING TO PROMOTE GOOD
- 25 POLICY. I AM NOT THE LOBBYIST FOR THE INDUSTRY,

- 1 AND MY INDUSTRY KNOWS THAT. BUT I HAVE A PROBLEM
- 2 WITH THINGS LIKE THIS BECAUSE WHEN WE TALKED WITH
- 3 MR. CAREY ABOUT THOSE RESOURCE ALLOCATIONS AND HOW
- 4 THINGS WERE GOING TO HAPPEN, MY CONCERNS WERE WHEN
- 5 A PERMIT HIT THE DESK AT THE LEA, DID THEY HAVE THE
- 6 PEOPLE THAT CAN MOVE THAT THING THROUGH. AND I
- 7 USED THE EXAMPLE THAT I HAD PERMITS THAT TOOK

FIVE

- 8 YEARS AND EIGHT YEARS TO GET DONE BEFORE IT EVER
- 9 EVEN GOT HERE. THAT'S NOT GOOD GOVERNMENT.
- 10 HEARING PANELS, PART OF AB 59, IF
- 11 SOMEBODY WANTED A HEARING PANEL, I SAID WOULD

THAT

- 12 PERSON HAVE TO WAIT FOR ONE OF THESE PART-TIME
- 13 MOONLIGHTING EMPLOYEES TO BE OFF TO BE ABLE TO

BE

- 14 AT THE HEARING PANEL. MR. CAREY'S RESPONSE WAS
- 15 THAT HE WOULD BE THERE. HE'D GO OUT, MAKE SURE

THE	
16	VIOLATION WAS THERE, AND HE'D BE AT THE HEARING
17	PANEL. I WILL TELL YOU IF I GET A TRAFFIC
TICKET	
18	DRIVING DOWN THE FREEWAY, I WANT THE COP THAT
WROTE	
19	THE TICKET. I DON'T WANT THE CHIEF OF POLICE
20	THERE. HE DOESN'T KNOW WHAT THE ISSUES WERE.
HE	
21	WASN'T THERE.
22	I THINK THAT'S A RESOURCE ISSUE.
AND	
23	THE REASON I BRING IT UP IS BECAUSE WHAT WE HAVE
24	ARE A PERSON THAT'S GOING TO BE THERE EIGHT DAYS
A	
25	MONTH, A PERSON THAT'S GOING TO BE THERE FOUR
DAYS	1.60
	160

- A MONTH, ANOTHER ONE FOR EIGHT, ANOTHER ONE FOR
- FOUR, ONE FOR THREE, ONE FOR THREE, ANOTHER ONE

FOR

- 3 TWO. SO WE'VE GOT -- AND ONE POTENTIALLY FOR
- 4 FOUR. SO WE'VE GOT THIS PART TIME -- I MEAN

CITY

5 OF SAN DIEGO HAS THE RIGHT. I DON'T QUESTION

THE

- 6 RIGHT OF THE CITY TO DEDESIGNATE. I DON'T OUESTION
 - 7 THE RIGHT OF THE CITY TO BECOME AN LEA.
- 8 WHAT I QUESTION IS DOES THE CITY

OF A

9 1,300,000 PEOPLE PUT A BALING WIRE PROGRAM

TOGETHER

- 10 AND THAT'S COMMENSURATE WITH THE LEVEL OF HEALTH
- 11 AND SAFETY OVERSIGHT THAT WE WANT TO PROMOTE?

Ι

- 12 DON'T THINK SO.
- 13 I THINK THEY GOT CAUGHT IN A
- 14 SITUATION, AS MR. CAREY EXPLAINED, THAT THEY

WERE

15 GOING TO CONTRACT WITH THE COUNTY TO PROVIDE

THOSE SERVICES IN THE INTERIM UNTIL THEY COULD HIRE 16 17 FULL-TIME STAFF. IT JUST DIDN'T WORK OUT. I 18 UNDERSTAND WHY IT DIDN'T WORK OUT WHEN I READ MR. 19 CONRAD'S LETTER SAYING THAT THEY COULDN'T ISSUE 20 PERMITS. THEY COULDN'T RUN PERMITS BY UNTIL THEY 21 GOT THEIR PERMISSION. I COULD SEE WHERE AN LEA MAY 22 FEEL THAT HIS JOB WAS BEING JEOPARDIZED A LITTLE BIT BY HAVING TO LIVE BY THAT CONDITION. 23 ALSO, IN TRYING TO COME UP WITH A 24 25 SOLUTION TO THIS, I WANTED TO FIND OUT IF WE DID 161

1 NOT DESIGNATE THE CITY TO BE THE LEA TODAY, IF

THE

2 CITY WOULD BE COMFORTABLE OR IF THE COUNTY WOULD

BE

- 3 COMFORTABLE IN -- BECAUSE THE WASTE BOARD
- 4 AUTOMATICALLY TAKES OVER AS THE ENFORCEMENT

AGENT

5 EITHER TODAY OR TOMORROW IF WE DON'T CERTIFY --

ΙN

6 CONTRACTING WITH THE COUNTY TO PROVIDE THE

SERVICES

- 7 AS LEA ON A CONTRACT BASIS UNTIL THEY GET A
- 8 FULL-TIME STAFF IN PLACE. THE HEAD OF THE
- 9 ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SERVICES SAID HE DIDN'T

HAVE A

- 10 PROBLEM, BUT IT BROUGHT UP ANOTHER ISSUE TALKING
- 11 ABOUT RESOURCES.
- 12 RICHARD PORTER, WHO HAS AN

ASTERISK

- 13 BY HIS NAME IN THE THING BECAUSE HE HASN'T
- SIGNED
- 14 THE AGREEMENT YET TO FULFILL, EVIDENTLY -- AND

I'M

- 15 GETTING THIS NOT FROM MR. PORTER BUT FROM HIS
- 16 BOSS -- MR. PORTER ISN'T GOING TO SIGN THAT
- 17 AGREEMENT. SO THAT'S FOUR DAYS THAT ARE NO

LONGER

- AVAILABLE. ALSO, THE DIRECTOR OF ENVIRONMENTAL
- 19 HEALTH SERVICES FOR SAN DIEGO COUNTY -- DURING

THE

- 20 HEARING WE HAD ASKED A QUESTION: IS THERE A
- 21 CONFLICT? DO THE PEOPLE THAT THESE LEA'S WORK

FOR

- 22 HAVE A RIGHT TO LET THEM WORK THERE? YOU KNOW,
- 23 SOME PEOPLE HAVE PROVISIONS IN THEIR

EMPLOYMENT

24 CONTRACTS THAT SAY YOU GOT TO GET MY

PERMISSION

25 BEFORE YOU GO TO WORK FOR SOMEBODY ELSE.

EVIDENTLY

1 MR. -- BOY, I'M GOING TO BUTCHER THIS NAME --AKITA 2 AND MR. GILB, BOTH SAN DIEGO LEA'S, ONE THAT WAS 3 GOING TO PROVIDE EIGHT DAYS OF SERVICE AND ONE THAT WAS GOING TO PROVIDE FOUR, ARE NOT GOING TO GET 5 THEIR BOSSES' AUTHORIZATION TO PERFORM THESE 6 SERVICE. 7 NOW, THOSE PEOPLE EVIDENTLY HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO APPEAL THAT, BUT I DON'T KNOW HOW 8 9 LONG THAT APPEAL TAKES. I DON'T THINK IT CAN BE 10 DONE BETWEEN NOW AND TONIGHT AT MIDNIGHT. BUT THAT11 TAKES THIS DAYS OF MONTHS FROM 36 DOWN TO 20. 12 TWENTY DAYS A MONTH OF AVAILABLE MANPOWER, WHICH IS 13 1920 MAN HOURS FOR WHAT'S GOING TO BE A 3700 MAN 14 HOUR JOB. 15 I OBVIOUSLY THINK THERE ARE SOME 16 ISSUES HERE WITH -- WITH THE INTEGRITY OF WHAT WE

DO. I BELIEVE SERIOUSLY THAT A CITY HAS A RIGHT

17

TO	
18	BE A CITY AND TO RUN ITS SERVICES, BUT WE HAVE
AN	
19	OBLIGATION TO MAKE SURE THAT HEALTH AND SAFETY
IS	
20	PROTECTED UNTIL THOSE PIECES GET PUT TOGETHER.
THE	
21	COUNTY OF L.A., WHEN THE CITY DECERTIFIED AND
22	BECAME ITS OWN LEA, THAT WAS A TWO-YEAR
23	TRANSITIONAL PROGRAM, ACCORDING TO RICHARD
HANSON	
24	TWO YEARS FOR THEM TO FINALLY RELINQUISH ALL OF
THE	
25	AUTHORITY OVER TO THE CITY OF L.A. IT WAS 163

- 1 COOPERATIVE EXCHANGE WHERE THEY TRAINED AND WENT
- 2 ALONG.
- 3 WHAT WE'RE LOOKING AT TODAY IS
- 4 CERTIFYING A PROGRAM THAT IS NOT EVEN GOING TO

BE

- 5 THE PROGRAM THAT'S GOING TO BE -- THE PROGRAM
- 6 STRUCTURE MAY BE THERE, BUT NONE OF THE

PRINCIPALS

- 7 ARE GOING TO BE THERE BECAUSE THEY'RE GOING OUT AND
- 8 HIRE ALL NEW PEOPLE EFFECTIVE JULY '98. SO
- WE'RE
 - 9 WILLING TO STAKE OUR -- I DON'T WANT TO USE THAT
- 10 WORD -- WE'RE WILLING TO ENSURE THIS PROGRAM

BASED

ON MOONLIGHTING EMPLOYEES ON A PROGRAM THAT WAS

PUT

- 12 TOGETHER UNFORTUNATELY BECAUSE WHAT THEY THOUGHT
- 13 WAS GOING TO HAPPEN, WHICH WAS THE COUNTY WOULD
- 14 CONTRACT WITH THEM, DIDN'T HAPPEN. AND THAT'S

NOT

- 15 A GOOD SITUATION TO BE IN.
- 16 I MEAN I FEEL BAD FOR THE CITY.

- 17 DON'T UNDERSTAND WHY WE CAN'T FULFILL THAT SERVICE
- 18 UNTIL JULY OF '98 WHEN THEY DO HAVE ALL THE PEOPLE
- 19 HIRED, WHEN THEY DO HAVE THE PEOPLE IN PLACE WHERE
- THEY HAVE BEEN TRAINED. I DON'T SEE THAT AS
- 21 INTERFERING WITH A CITY'S RIGHT TO DO THEIR JOB

OR

- 22 IN OUR OBLIGATION TO ENSURE THE HEALTH AND SAFETY.
- 23 AND THEN FINALLY, I'VE GOT TO SAY ONE
- 24 LAST THING. WE AS A BOARD HAVE ADOPTED A STRATEGIC
- 25 PLAN. WE AS A BOARD HAVE WORKED VERY HARD WITH 164

1	STAFF TO DETERMINE WHERE WE ARE GOING TO GO AS
AN	
2	AGENCY. AND THE THIRD GOAL OF THAT FOUR WE
ONLY	
3	HAVE FOUR GOALS IN OUR STRATEGIC PLAN. AND THE
4	THIRD ONE IS TO ENSURE COMPLIANCE WITH WASTE
5	MANAGEMENT STATUTES AND REGULATIONS WHILE
6	MAXIMIZING PROTECTION OF PUBLIC HEALTH AND
SAFETY	
7	AND THE ENVIRONMENT. THE WAY THAT WE ARE GOING
TO	
8	DO THAT, WHAT OUR PLAN IS IS TO NURTURE LEA'S,
TO	
9	MAKE THEM TO CONTINUE TO TRAIN THEM, TO MAKE
10	THEM BETTER, AND THROUGH THAT MECHANISM ENSURE
THAT	
11	THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTIONS ARE IN PLACE.
12	AND I HAVE A QUESTION FOR THIS
BOARD	
13	THAT VOTED UNANIMOUSLY ON THE STRATEGIC PLAN.
IS	
14	THE PROJECT IN FRONT OF US, IS THE PROGRAM IN
FRONT	

15	OF US TO CERTIFY THIS TEMPORARY LEA STATUS, IS
THAT	
16	WHAT YOU ENVISIONED WHEN YOU VOTED IS THAT
THE	
17	LEVEL THAT WE WANT TO BE AT BECAUSE I NEED TO
KNOW	
18	IF THAT'S THE LEVEL OF EXPERTISE AND THE LEVEL
OF	
19	COMMITMENT WE WANT TO MEET THE STRATEGIC PLAN
IS US	
20	LETTING THIS GO FORWARD BECAUSE IF IT IS,
THAT'S	
21	NOT THE STRATEGIC PLAN THAT I HELPED WORK ON.
22	AND I THINK THAT THE CITY OF SAN
23	DIEGO CAN COME IN IN JUNE OF '98 WHEN THEY'VE
HAD	
24	THE TIME TO HIRE COMPETENT HELP, AND I DON'T
HAVE A	
25	PROBLEM WITH THAT. AND THAT'S THE WRONG WORD.

165

1 DEDICATED, FULL-TIME EMPLOYEES BECAUSE THEY

ARE

2 COMPETENT. I MISSPOKE AND I APOLOGIZE. BUT,

YOU

3 KNOW, WE'VE GOT SOMETHING VERY CRITICAL HERE.

Ι

- 4 MEAN THIS IS A HEALTH AND SAFETY ISSUE. THIS ISN'T
- 5 ABOUT ME BEING IN THE INDUSTRY. IT'S ABOUT ME
- 6 UNFORTUNATELY KNOWING WHAT IT MEANS TO HAVE

PERMITS

- 7 SIT IN OFFICES FOR FIVE YEARS BECAUSE THOSE FIVE
- 8 YEARS COST MONEY AND NOTHING GETS DONE.
- 9 I APOLOGIZE -- I THANK THE BOARD

FOR

10 LETTING ME SAY THOSE THINGS. I'M VERY

PASSIONATE

ABOUT THIS, AND I TRUTHFULLY HOPE THAT WE CAN

HAVE

- 12 A RESOLUTION WHERE WE ARE THE ENFORCEMENT AGENCY
- 13 UNTIL THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO HAS THE TIME TO PUT
- 14 TOGETHER FULL-TIME PEOPLE.
- 15 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: MR. FRAZEE.

16	BOARD MEMBER FRAZEE: YES, THANK YOU,
MR.	
17	CHAIRMAN. IF THIS DECISION WERE ONE TO BE MADE
IN	
18	A VACUUM AND WITHOUT CONCERN FOR STATUTE, I
AND	
19	IF IT WERE A DECISION THAT PITTED THE COUNTY
VERSUS	
20	THE CITY, I WOULD OPT FOR THE COUNTY IN A SPLIT
21	SECOND. BUT THAT'S NOT WHAT WE HAVE BEFORE US.
22	WHAT WE HAVE BEFORE US IS A DECISION BY THE
CITY,	
23	ACCORDING TO STATUTE, TO WITHDRAW THE
DESIGN	TATION
24	OF A COUNTY AS THEIR LEA.
25	SO THE QUESTION THEN THAT COMES 166

- 1 BEFORE US IS THE CITY QUALIFIED AND HAVE THEY
- 2 PROVEN THOSE QUALIFICATIONS TO THE SATISFACTION

OF

3 THIS BOARD TO PERFORM THE FUNCTIONS OF THE LEA.

Ι

- 4 THINK THEY HAVE.
- 5 MUCH OF WHAT MR. JONES HAS INDICATED,
- 6 I THINK, IS BORN OUT OF SOME OF THE SAME CONCERNS
- 7 THAT I HAVE. WE ALL HAVE OUR SUSPICIONS OF WHAT
- 8 THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO IS UP TO. THERE IS A CLEAR
- 9 VIEW, I THINK, BY MANY CITY COUNCILMEMBERS THAT ALL
- 10 THEY HAVE TO DO IS TO BECOME THE LEA, AND THEN
- 11 THEY'RE GOING TO CONTROL THE SOLID WASTE WORLD

IN

- 12 SAN DIEGO COUNTY. AND I DON'T THINK THAT'S THE
- 13 CASE, AND THAT'S CERTAINLY NOT APPROPRIATE.
- 14 THE QUESTION OF -- AND ONE OF THE
- MAIN CONCERNS I'VE HAD IS THE USE OF THIS

AUTHORITY

- 16 TO EXERCISE LAND USE CONTROL, WHICH IS CLEARLY
- NOT
- 17 PROVIDED FOR IN STATUTE. BUT THE FACT OF THE
- 18 MATTER IS THAT THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO CAN

EXERCISE

- 19 LAND USE CONTROL ANYWAY WITHOUT THIS. IT'S ONE
- OF
- 20 THE FACTS OF LIFE. I DON'T THINK WE CAN CONVICT
- THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO IN ADVANCE EVEN

THOUGH,

22 AGAIN, WE HAVE OUR SUSPICIONS THAT AS TO

TAHW

- THEY'RE UP TO. I THINK THEY'VE MET THE LETTER
- AND
- 24 THE TEST OF THE LAW, AND I CAN SEE NO OPTION FOR
- US
- 25 OTHER THAN TO GRANT THEM THIS AUTHORITY UNDER

THE

- 1 LAW, MUCH AS I WOULD LIKE IT TO BE OTHERWISE.
- 2 AGAIN, LET ME REITERATE THAT. BUT

I

- 3 JUST THINK THAT WE CANNOT GO ON SUSPICIONS. WE
- 4 MUST MEET THE LAW OR TO GET THE LAW CHANGED.

AND I

- 5 SAID THAT, I THINK, FROM MY VERY FIRST
- EXPERIENCE
- 6 WHEN I WAS FIRST ON THIS BOARD WHEN WE HAD ANOTHER
 - 7 DEDESIGNATION COME UP. AND I SAID AT THE TIME I
 - 8 THINK THAT'S ONE OF THE FAILINGS OF THE STATUTE

IS

- 9 THAT IT ALLOWS THAT EASY EXIT FROM REGIONAL
- 10 AUTHORITY. AND THAT'S WHERE THE AUTHORITY OUGHT

TO

- 11 LIE IS REGIONALLY.
- 12 I THINK IN THE CASE OF THE CITY

AND

13 COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO, IT'S UNFORTUNATE THAT ALL

THIS

- 14 CAME ABOUT DURING TUMULTUOUS TIME IN OUR COUNTY
- 15 WITH THE LEAVING OF THE CITY MANAGER AND OF THE

16	ASSISTANT CITY MANAGER, WHO ARE BOTH KEY PLAYERS
IN	
17	THIS, AT THE SAME TIME THAT THE SOLID WASTE
SYSTEM	I
18	WAS BEING SOLD BY THE COUNTY. AND ALL THAT'S
ADDED	
19	AN EXTRA DIMENSION TO THIS THAT I WISH WERE NOT
20	HERE. BUT TAKING THOSE THINGS ASIDE, AGAIN,
YOU	
21	KNOW, I WOULD OPT FOR THIS DELAY, BUT I DON'T
KNOW	
22	WHAT THE DELAY IS GOING TO ACCOMPLISH. THIS IS
AN	
23	INTERIM OR A PROBATIONARY CERTIFICATION. AND I
24	MUST, IN KEEPING WITH WHAT I WAS SWORN TO DO,
TO	
25	UPHOLD THE STATUTES OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
I	1.60

- 1 MUST VOTE FOR THAT.
- BOARD MEMBER GOTCH: MR. CHAIR, I HAVE

Α

3 QUESTION FOR THE CITY. I DON'T KNOW WHICH ONE

OF

4 YOU CHOOSES, MAYBE MR. CAREY, AND THAT QUESTION

IS

5 WHAT'S THE RUSH? FRANKLY, I ONLY SEE POSITIVES

IN

- 6 ALLOWING YOURSELF ANOTHER SIX MONTHS TO LET THE
- 7 PROCESS PROGRESS.
- 8 MR. CAREY: WELL, THERE ISN'T A RUSH.

AND

9 I DON'T FEEL THAT WE ARE RUSHING. I FEEL WE

ARE

10 VERY WELL PREPARED. SOME OF THE COMMENTS THAT

MR.

JONES HAVE MADE TODAY ARE NEW TO ME WITH

RESPECT TO

12 THE DEPARTMENT SAYING THAT THEIR STAFF WILL NOT

BE

13 ABLE TO MEET THEIR COMMITMENTS. I HAVE

COMMITMENTS

- 14 FROM KEN CALVERT AND DAN AVERA BOTH. IF SOMETHING
- 15 HAS TRANSPIRED, THEN I WOULD HAVE TO QUESTION THE
- 16 MOTIVES OF THE COUNTY BEHIND ALL THIS, AND WHY

IS

17 IT THAT THE COUNTY WANTS TO MAINTAIN SOME SORT

OF

- 18 CONTROL AFTER THE FACT. THAT WOULD BOTHER ME.
- WE'RE FUNDED. WE FEEL WE'RE
- 20 STAFFED. WE OBVIOUSLY HAVE YOUR STAFF APPROVAL

OF

21 OUR PROGRAM PLAN. OUR WHOLE INTENT IN THIS WAS

ТО

- 22 HAVE THIS SEEMINGLESS -- SEAMLESS TRANSITION
- 23 BETWEEN THE COUNTY AND THE CITY. AND WE

ATTEMPTED

- 24 TO CONTRACT WITH THE COUNTY. AND AS YOU INDICATED,
- 25 THE LETTER TO MR. CHANDLER ON AUGUST 15TH INDICATED

- 1 THAT THAT WAS OUR INTENT. THAT CERTAINLY WAS.
- ON
- 2 OCTOBER 12TH WE FINALLY HAD THAT MEETING WE

ASKED

FOR WITH THE COUNTY. THAT'S WHEN THEY FINALLY

WERE

- 4 ABLE TO SIT DOWN WITH US. I HAD TO HAVE THE
- 5 PROGRAM PLAN SUBMITTED TO YOUR STAFF ON OCTOBER
- 6 15TH. THEY SAID THEY WOULD GET BACK TO US.

THEY

- 7 DID AFTER I HAD TO SUBMIT THE PLAN. THAT'S WHY
- YOU
 - 8 HAD A PLAN THAT HAD CONTINGENCIES IN IT THAT WE
 - 9 WERE GOING TO USE THE COUNTY.
- 10 THROUGH THAT WHOLE PROCESS, THEY
- $_{
 m LED}$
- 11 US TO BELIEVE THEY WERE GOING TO CONTINUE TO

HAVE A

- 12 WORKING RELATIONSHIP WITH US. WE ATTEMPTED --
- THAT
- 13 WAS PROFESSIONAL COURTESY THAT WE WERE TRYING TO
- 14 DO -- THAT COLEMAN'S LETTER WAS TALKING ABOUT

WE

- 15 WOULD LIKE TO BE PART OF THE PROCESS IF PERMITS
- 16 COME IN. MR. AVERA HIMSELF TOLD ME THAT HE DIDN'T
- 17 WANT TO ACCEPT PERMITS THAT HE COULDN'T FOLLOW
- 18 THROUGH, THAT HE THOUGHT IT WAS IMPORTANT THAT THE
- 19 CITY BECOME A PART OF THAT PROCESS.
- 20 SO WE WERE TRYING TO WORK FOR

THIS

- 21 TRANSITION THAT SEEMED TO BE IN THE BEST INTEREST
- OF NOT ONLY THE COMMUNITY, BUT THE FACILITY
- OPERATORS. SO I DON'T THINK WE'RE RUSHING.

WE'VE

- 24 GIVEN APPROPRIATE NOTIFICATION. WE'RE WELL WITHIN
- 25 THE STATUTE OF THAT, AND WE'RE PREPARED TO HIT THE

1	GROUND RUNNING. THAT'S WHAT WE WANT TO DO.
WE	
2	DON'T WANT TO HOLD UP THE COUNTY OF L.A. OR
THE	
3	CITY OF L.A. AS THE BENCHMARK FOR SOMETHING
THAT	
4	MIGHT HAVE TAKEN TWO YEARS TO TRANSITION. WE
DON'T	
5	THINK THAT'S APPROPRIATE. WE'RE PREPARED TO DO
6	THAT RIGHT NOW.
7	BOARD MEMBER GOTCH: THE OTHER QUESTION
IS	
8	FOR STAFF. AND THAT IS, I GUESS I'M TRYING TO
9	FIGURE OUT. WITH OUR OPTIONS HERE, AND I
KNOW	
10	THESE ARE LIMITED OPTIONS, I DON'T KNOW IF
MR.	
11	JONES IS MOVING TOWARDS A DISAPPROVAL OR NOT.
BUT	
12	I GUESS I'M TRYING TO FIGURE OUT HOW THIS COULD
13	WORK IN A MANNER WHERE WE WOULD ALLOW THE
CITY	

ANOTHER SIX MONTHS OR SO, AND THEN AT THAT

14

POINT

- 15 THEY HAVE THE OPTION OF COMING BACK, I WOULD ASSUME
- 16 THEN, FOR THE LEA DESIGNATION.
- 17 MS. RICE: CERTAINLY. YOU ARE ASKING

ΙF

18 THIS WERE DISAPPROVED TODAY AND WE BECAME THE

EA,

- 19 COULD THEY COME BACK?
- 20 BOARD MEMBER GOTCH: I GUESS IT'S

EITHER

- 21 THE DISAPPROVAL OR THE NO ACTION. I'M ASSUMING
- 22 IT'S THE SAME ANSWER.
- MS. RICE: CORRECT. CORRECT. YES, AND

I

- 24 ASSUME, OF COURSE, THEY COULD COME BACK.
- 25 BOARD MEMBER GOTCH: SO THEN WE COULD -

_

- 1 BUT WE COULD CONCEIVABLY THEN PUT A TIME LINE WITH
- 2 THE MOTION, WHICH IS SOMETHING THAT I WOULD LEAN
- 3 MORE TOWARDS.
- 4 BOARD MEMBER JONES: YEAH. ONE THING,
- 5 REASON I KEEP REFERRING TO JULY 1ST OF '98 IS THAT
- 6 IN STATUTE IT SAYS IF THEY ARE NOT APPROVED AND THE
- 7 WASTE BOARD TAKES OVER AS THE ENFORCEMENT AGENT,
- 8 THEY ARE THE ENFORCEMENT AGENT UNTIL THE END OF THE
- 9 FISCAL YEAR, WHICH WOULD BE JUNE 30TH. SO IT WOULD
- 10 BE JULY 1ST WOULD BE THE NEXT DAY OF THE NEXT
- 11 FISCAL YEAR. IS THAT --
- MR. CAREY: I THINK THE BOARD HAS THE
- 13 RIGHT TO CUT THAT SHORT AS DIRECTED BY THE BOARD.
- 14 THE BOARD CAN MAKE THAT DATE SHORTER. IT DOESN'T
- 15 HAVE TO GO TO THE FISCAL YEAR.
- 16 I'D LIKE AN OPPORTUNITY TO FULLY

THEN	
17	RESPOND IF THIS IS THE DIRECTION THAT YOU ARE
18	LOOKING TO LEAN, TO TALK A LITTLE MORE IN DETAIL
19	ABOUT WHY I THINK WE ARE PREPARED TO DO THIS
NOW	
20	AND WHY I DON'T THINK IT WOULD MAKE GOOD SENSE
FOR	
21	THE BOARD STAFF, AS WELL QUALIFIED AS THEY ARE,
TO	
22	DO THIS LONG DISTANCE OVERSIGHT OF SAN DIEGO
23	COUNTY, AND IN PARTICULAR THE CITY OF SAN
DIEGO.	
24	AND I GUESS I WOULD JUST HAVE TO
SAY	
25	THAT CERTAINLY TRAVEL AND COST ARE TWO
CONSID	ERA-

172

- 1 TIONS THAT WE WOULD HAVE. I MEAN I THINK THOSE
- 2 COSTS WOULD BE PASSED ALONG TO THE CITY. I

DON'T

- 3 THINK THAT YOUR STAFF IS GOING TO ABSORB THOSE
- 4 COSTS AND JUST LET THE CITY PICK UP WHAT YOU

FEEL

- 5 IS ADEQUATE TRAINING TO HIT THE GROUND. BUT WE
- 6 REALLY BELIEVE THAT OUR COMMUNITY, THE CITY OF

SAN

7 DIEGO, AND THE FACILITY OPERATORS, WHETHER

PUBLIC

8 SECTOR OR PRIVATE SECTOR OPERATORS, WILL BE

BETTER

- 9 SERVED BY AN LEA THAT IS IN THEIR OWN BACKYARD.
- 10 AND I CAN JUST DO WHAT I DID

BEFORE

11 THE PERMITTING AND ENFORCEMENT COMMITTEE IS

JUST

12 ASSURE YOU THAT I AM DEVOTING, EVEN THOUGH I'M

Α

13 CONTRACT EMPLOYEE, A HUNDRED PERCENT PLUS OF

MY

14 TIME TO THIS PROGRAM, THAT I HAVE A CIVIL

ENGINEER

15 THAT HAS BEEN FULLY ASSIGNED TO THE PROGRAM --

TO

16 THE CITY MANAGER'S OFFICE FOR THIS LEA. I

WON'T

17 SIT HERE AND TELL YOU THAT SHE WILL BE THAT

CIVIL

18 ENGINEER FROM HERE UNTIL ETERNITY BECAUSE

EVERYBODY

CAN WALK; BUT ON THE OTHER HAND, WE WANT TO

RECRUIT

OPENLY FOR THOSE POSITIONS. AND WE'RE NOT

LOOKING

- 21 TO PUT JUST ANYBODY INTO THESE POSITIONS, MYSELF
- 22 INCLUDED.
- AND I'VE STOOD ON RECORD HERE

BEFORE

- 24 THE P&E COMMITTEE TO SAY THAT I WASN'T IN THE
- 25 RUNNING AS A PROGRAM MANAGER. AND THAT, YOU

KNOW,

1	IN A LOT OF WAYS SHOULD GIVE YOU SOME FEELING
OF	
2	CONFIDENCE THAT I'M NOT GOING TO BE RUN BY THE
3	CITY. I AM A CONTRACT EMPLOYEE, BUT I AM GOING
TO	
4	DO WHAT'S RIGHT AS AN LEA, AS AN OFFICER OF THE
5	COURT, AND AS AN ATTORNEY, AND AS A FORMER LEA
AND	
6	REGISTERED ENVIRONMENTAL SPECIALIST. I CAN
JUST	
7	ASSURE YOU MY REPUTATION IS ON THE LINE, AND
I'M	
8	NOT GOING TO BE USED BY THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO
OR	
9	ANYBODY ELSE. I JUST WANT TO ASSURE YOU THAT
WE'RE	
10	PREPARED, MS. GOTCH, TO GO FORWARD WITH THIS
NOW.	
11	BUYING TIME RIGHT NOW WON'T BUY
US	
12	ANYTHING. WHAT IT'S GOING TO DO IS INTERRIPT

CONTINUITY OF SERVICE THAT WE'RE PREPARED TO

THIS

GIVE	
14	TO THE FACILITIES THAT ARE OPERATING RIGHT NOW.
15	AND TO BREAK THAT WON'T BE IN THE BEST, I DON'T
16	THINK THE BEST USE OF OUR STAFF OR YOUR STAFF.
17	BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: MR. CHAIRMAN,
THE	
18	PROBLEMS THAT MR. JONES HAVE BROUGHT UP ARE
SERIOUS	
19	ONES, AND I'VE SHARED, YOU KNOW, MY CONCERNS
ABOUT	
20	ON THE ONE HAND SUPPORTING LEA'S, ON THE OTHER
HAND	
21	MAKING SURE THAT WE'RE MAINTAINING A FLOOR OF
22	EXCELLENCE ABOVE WHICH WE EXPECT EVERY LEA TO
BE.	
23	I THINK MOST OF THE PROBLEMS THAT
24	HAVE BEEN CITED THOUGH ARE POTENTIAL PROBLEMS.
I	
25	DON'T THINK THAT THE LEA'S IN EXISTENCE SO WE
CAN	154

174

- 1 REALLY GET A HANDLE ON IT. I THINK THAT THE
- 2 POTENTIALS FOR CONFLICT EXIST THROUGHOUT THE STATE
- 3 IN ALMOST EVERY LEA. THE OVERSIGHT, USUALLY IT'S A
- 4 COUNTY BEING THE LEA FOR A CITY LANDFILL. IT'S NOT
- 5 THE OTHER WAY AROUND. BUT THE POTENTIAL CONFLICTS
- 6 EXIST EVERYWHERE. AND I WOULD SAY THAT THE
- 7 RESOLUTION TO THE CONCERNS IS MORE ALONG THE LINES
- 8 OF MONITORING THEIR PERFORMANCE AND SAYING THAT WE
- 9 WILL GO AHEAD AND DESIGNATE, BUT SAY THAT WE NEED
- 10 TO, GIVEN THE HIGH LEVEL OF CONCERN THAT'S BEEN
- 11 EXPRESSED BY MORE THAN ONE BOARD MEMBER AND THE
- 12 ISSUES THAT HAVE BEEN IDENTIFIED HERE, THAT WE,

YOU

- 13 KNOW, DO SOME ADDITIONAL LEVEL OF SCRUTINY AND
- MONITORING OF THEIR PERFORMANCE INITIALLY. I

DON'T

- 15 KNOW WHAT YOU'D CALL IT, KIND OF A PROBATIONARY
- 16 PERIOD OR WHATEVER YOU WANT, TO KIND OF MAKE

SURE

17 THAT THEY, IN FACT, DO RISE TO THE LEVEL THAT

 ${ t WE}$

- 18 EXPECT OF EVERY LEA IN THE STATE.
- 19 THAT WOULD BE MY PREFERRED

SOLUTION

- 20 IN THE SITUATION RATHER THAN AT THIS POINT HAVING
- OUR STAFF STEP INTO THE SITUATION AND FUNCTION

ΙN

THE LEA. IT'S NOT TO DENY OR PLAY DOWN YOUR

VERY

LEGITIMATE CONCERNS THAT YOU'VE RAISED. I

THINK

THEY'RE SIMILAR TO ONES I'VE EXPRESSED IN

OTHER

25 SITUATIONS.

- 1 BOARD MEMBER FRAZEE: LET'S EXAMINE
 THE
- 2 DELAY SCENARIO FOR A MOMENT. UNDER THAT WE WOULD
- 3 IN EFFECT DENY THIS APPLICATION AT THIS POINT.

WE

GO

- 4 WOULD ASSUME THE ROLE OF LEA FOR A PERIOD UNTIL THE
- 5 BEGINNING OF THE NEW FISCAL YEAR. AND BASED ON
- 6 THAT THEN, WE'RE ASKING THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO TO
- 7 OUT AND HIRE ALL KINDS OF PERMANENT STAFF WITHOUT
- 8 ANY ASSURANCE AT THAT POINT ONCE THEY HIRE THOSE
- 9 PEOPLE. IT'S DIFFERENT, I THINK, IN MOST OF THE
- 10 OTHER CASES THAT WE'VE EXPERIENCED WHERE THERE'S
- 11 BEEN A SINGLE LEA, ONE PERSON, AND THAT PERSON CAN
- 12 BE MOVED AND ABSORBED; BUT WHEN YOU'RE TALKING
- 13 ABOUT HIRING A COMPLETE STAFF, PUTTING THEM ON

- 14 BOARD, AND THEN COMING BACK TO THIS BOARD FOR FINAL
- 15 CERTIFICATION AND WE SAY, "WELL, NO. WE KIND OF
- 16 LIKE THIS BEING THE LEA. MAYBE WE'LL STICK WITH
- 17 THIS." WHAT DOES THE CITY DO WITH EIGHT OR TEN

OR

- 18 TWELVE PEOPLE THAT THEY HAVE HIRED AT THAT POINT?
- 19 AND THAT, I GUESS, IS MY PRINCIPAL CONCERN OF THE
- 20 DELAY SCENARIO.
- 21 I THINK WE OUGHT TO BITE THE

BULLET

- 22 AND GET IT OVER WITH, HOPE FOR THE BEST, INVOKE THE
- 23 PROBATIONARY PERIOD, AND WORK WITH THIS INTERIM
- 24 STAFF TO SEE THAT THEY PERFORM THE FUNCTION WELL
- 25 AND WITHIN THE LAW.

1	CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: MR. RELIS.
2	BOARD MEMBER RELIS: MR. CHAIR, IN
3	COMMITTEE I VOTED WITH MR. FRAZEE TO MOVE THIS,
THE	
4	RECOMMENDATION TO SUPPORT THE CITY BEING LEA
5	DESIGNATED. BUT LET ME JUST RAISE A COUPLE OF
6	POINTS THAT I THINK MAYBE HAVEN'T BEEN TOUCHED
ON	
7	YET, AND I THINK THE ARGUMENTS HAVE BEEN
EXCELL	ENT
8	BOTH WAYS. THE WORKLOAD FACTOR. OKAY. NOW,
9	SUPPOSE WE WERE THE LEA. WE'VE MADE THIS AND
I	
10	WAS THE ONE WHO USED THE TERM "MOONLIGHTING"
11	BECAUSE I SAW THIS ASSORTMENT OF PEOPLE AND
HOURS,	
12	AND IT LOOKED A LITTLE STRANGE, SO I QUESTIONED
YOU	
13	ON THAT.
14	BUT LET'S SUPPOSE WE'RE THE LEA.
I	
15	MEAN WHAT'S THE FUNCTIONAL DIFFERENCE BETWEEN
16	CETTING ON THE DUONE AND ONE OF OUR DEODIE HAS

10	
17 SHOW UP FOR A MEETING AT SUCH-AND-	-SUCH A DATE
AND	
18 THEY'RE BOOKED, YOU KNOW. I MEAN I	'M NOT SAYING
19 THIS TO COUNTER SO MUCH AS JUST TO	CLARIFY.
IS	
20 THAT FUNCTIONALLY ANY DIFFERENT TH	IAN THE
21 ARRANGEMENT THAT'S PROPOSED? AND	IF NOT,
THEN I	
22 THINK IT MAYBE UNDERMINES THAT PAR	RTICULAR
LINE OF	
23 REASONING.	
24 I GUESS THE BOTTOM L	INE IS, AS
MR.	
FRAZEE SAYS, ARE THEY QUALIFIED?	AND THE
ANSWER	
177	

- 1 SEEMS TO BE YES. SO THE FUNCTIONS OF THE LEA CAN
- 2 BE PERFORMED. I AGREE WITH MR. CHESBRO THAT
 -- AND
- 3 I SAID THIS IN COMMITTEE -- IF WE GO DOWN THE LINE
- 4 OF QUESTIONING THE MOTIVES HERE TOO FAR OR THE
- 5 POTENTIAL CONFLICTS, WE COULD CARRY THIS DISCUSSION
- 6 STATEWIDE. AND I CERTAINLY DON'T WANT TO DO THAT.
- 7 SO I BELIEVE THAT MY CONCERNS HAVE BEEN SATISFIED
- 8 PROVIDED WE WATCH THIS CLOSELY BECAUSE THAT LETTER
- 9 DID -- I MEAN MY FACE VALUE READ OF THE LETTER WAS
- 10 TROUBLING, YOU KNOW. AND I'VE HEARD AN EXPLANATION
- 11 OF THAT, BUT, YOU KNOW, WHEN YOU ARE BASICALLY --

- 12 IF I'M NOT MISREADING THAT, IT SOUNDED LIKE, WELL,
- 13 WE WOULD HOLD -- WE WOULD WANT TO SLOW DOWN LOOKING
- 14 AT ANY LEA PERMITS COMING FORWARD.
- NOW, IF I CAN BE ASSURED THAT

ISN'T

- 16 THE CASE, THEN I'M SATISFIED WITH THE LEA.
- 17 MR. CAREY: I CAN ASSURE YOU THAT

THAT'S

NOT THE INTENT, AND THAT WASN'T THE INTENT.

I CAN

- 19 SEE HOW THAT INTERPRETATION CAN BE MADE FROM WHAT
- 20 YOU READ OF THAT LETTER. BUT THAT WASN'T THE
- 21 INTENT. THE INTENT WAS TO HAVE -- THIS

TRANSITION

- 22 WAS TO HAVE THIS COOPERATIVE WORKING AGREEMENT WITH
- 23 THE COUNTY AND ANYTHING CAME IN THAT WE COULD END
- 24 UP FINISHING BECAUSE, AS YOU SAID, IT TAKES A LONG
- 25 TIME TO GET THESE PERMITS THROUGH. AND

CERTAINLY

- 1 WITHIN THE 90 DAYS THAT WE HAD STARTED THE CLOCK
- 2 TICKING, THEY WEREN'T GOING TO BE ABLE TO GET
 A
- 3 PERMIT IN AND PROBABLY GET IT OUT AT THE OTHER END,
 - 4 AND WE WERE GOING TO HAVE TO PICK UP THOSE
- 5 RESPONSIBILITIES AND MOVE FORWARD. AND WE WANTED
- 6 TO HAVE THAT ABILITY TO WORK WITH THEM RIGHT FROM
- 7 THE FRONT AND NOT HAVE IT HANDED OVER TO US TODAY
- 8 OR TOMORROW.
- 9 BOARD MEMBER JONES: MR. CAREY, YOU KNOW,
- 10 I AGREE. I MEAN I DON'T HAVE ANY PROBLEM WITH WHAT
- 11 MY FELLOW BOARD MEMBERS ARE SAYING. I DON'T KNOW
- 12 IF -- TWO THINGS COME UP. ONE IS THE COUNTY OF SAN

- 13 DIEGO WHO YOU WANTED -- WHO THE CITY WANTED TO
- 14 CONTRACT WITH READ THE SAME LETTER THAT I READ

AND

- 15 SAID WE CAN'T DO BUSINESS THIS WAY. CAN'T DO
- 16 BUSINESS HAVING TO GET AUTHORITY FROM THE

CITY

17 COUNCIL ON ANYTHING THAT GOES FORWARD BECAUSE

AS

18 THE LEA THOSE ARE SEPARATE DUTIES. SO THEY DID

NOT

- 19 GO FORWARD WITH IT.
- 20 MY QUESTION, AND I THINK MY

QUESTION

21 PROBABLY NEEDS TO BE TO MR. HEAP, IS THAT IF --

I'M

22 TALKING ABOUT TWO THINGS HERE, AND I DIDN'T MEAN

TO

23 SURPRISE YOU WITH THIS. I GOT THIS BETWEEN 12

AND

- 1:30 ON THIS BECAUSE IT'S -- YOU KNOW, HOW -- I
- 25 MEAN I HAVE A PROBLEM WITH A BUNCH OF PART-

TIME

- 1 PEOPLE. I HAVE A REAL PROBLEM WITH STUFF NOT
- 2 MOVING THROUGH. I MEAN -- AND I KNOW I'VE

MADE

- 3 THAT CLEAR.
- 4 IF YOU ARE GOING TO LOSE 16 OF

YOUR

5 36 HOURS THAT ARE AVAILABLE TO YOU, I DON'T

THINK

6 YOU COMPLY WITH 43200 OF THE STATUTE. THAT'S

MY

7 CONCERN IS THAT BASED ON THE STAFFING, YOU

CAN'T

8 COMPLY. YOU GOT TO GO OUT AND FIND OTHER LEA'S

NOW

9 TO FILL THOSE HOLES. THAT IS AN ISSUE THAT

BOTHERS

- 10 ME.
- SO I WOULD ASK MR. HEAP, AND HE
- 12 PROBABLY CAN'T ANSWER FOR THE CITY, BUT IF HE
- 13 WOULD, I WOULD LIKE TO ASK A QUESTION. I HAVE

SAID

- 14 I THINK YOU AS A CITY HAVE THE AUTHORITY TO DO
- 15 THESE THINGS BY STATUTE. I JUST HAVE A QUESTION

- DEALING WITH THE MANPOWER AND THOSE TYPES OF
 THINGS, WHICH I'VE MADE CLEAR. YOU TRIED TO
- ENTER
- 18 INTO -- YOU MEANING THE CITY -- TRIED TO ENTER INTO
- AN AGREEMENT WITH THE COUNTY IN THE INTERIM TO
- 20 FULFILL THOSE LEA OBLIGATIONS UNTIL YOU GOT

YOUR

- 21 OWN STAFF PUT TOGETHER. AND THE COUNTY REJECTED
- 22 BECAUSE OF THOSE COUPLE OF CONDITIONS. THEY
- WEREN'T COMFORTABLE WITH THE IDEA OF HAVING TO

GO

- TO CITY COUNCIL.
- MR. HEAP: I'M NOT SURE ABOUT THAT.

THAT

180

1	MAY BE SOMETHING THE COUNTY INDICATED TO YOU.
I	
2	WASN'T PRIVY TO THE MEETINGS WHEN THE COUNTY
3	ARTICULATED THE REASON WHY THEY DECIDED NOT TO
GO	
4	FORWARD WITH THAT IDEA.
5	BOARD MEMBER JONES: ALL RIGHT. I'M
6	SORRY. IF THE BOARD WAS THE ASSUMED THE
ROLE,	
7	DOESN'T DESIGNATE TODAY, AND CONTRACTED WITH
THE	
8	COUNTY TO FULFILL THOSE SERVICES WHERE THEY
WOULD	
9	ANSWER TO US IN THAT SIX-MONTH PERIOD, WOULD
THAT	
10	HAVE ACHIEVED WHAT YOUR INITIAL GOAL WAS?
11	MR. HEAP: TO CONTRACT WITH THE
COUNTY	?
12	BOARD MEMBER JONES: RIGHT.
13	MR. HEAP: INITIALLY, AND I WISH THAT
14	OTHERS WERE HERE TO ANSWER THIS. I'LL DO THE
BEST	
15	I CAN TO ANSWER THIS QUESTION BECAUSE THIS IS

AN

- 16 APPROPRIATE QUESTION. OBVIOUSLY, FROM THE CITY'S
- 17 PERSPECTIVE, IT WOULD HAVE ASSISTED US IN TAKING
- 18 UPON OURSELVES THE RESPONSIBILITY TO BE THE LEA, TO
- 19 HAVE THE COUNTY HELP US IN THIS INTERIM PERIOD, NO
- 20 DOUBT. I THINK THE RECORD'S CLEAR THAT THAT'S THE
- CASE.
- BUT THE BOTTOM LINE IS THAT DID
 NOT
- 23 HAPPEN. AND WE BELIEVE THAT THE BEST ALTERNATIVE,
- 24 THE NEXT BEST ALTERNATIVE TO US, TO THE CITY OF SAN
- DIEGO, WOULD BE TO BECOME THE LEA BECAUSE WE 181

1	BELIEVE WE'VE MET THE CONDITIONS ARTICULATED
AND	
2	PROMULGATED IN THE STATUTES THAT ALLOW US TO
DO	
3	THAT. SO WE BELIEVE THIS IS THE NEXT BEST
4	ALTERNATIVE. I UNDERSTAND YOUR QUESTION AND
5	UNDERSTAND WHAT YOU'RE SAYING AND SEEING HOW
THIS	
6	IS AN ANALOGOUS SCENARIO, IF YOU WANT TO CALL
IT	
7	THAT, BUT WE BELIEVE THAT THAT'S OBVIOUSLY NOT
WHAT	
8	WE PREFER. WE REALLY TRULY BELIEVE, THE CITY OF
9	SAN DIEGO TRULY BELIEVES THAT WE'VE MET THE
10	REQUIREMENTS. WE'VE MET 43200.
11	AND THAT'S THE RIGHT FOCUS. HAVE
WE	
12	MET 43200? AND THIS IS WHAT CONCERNS ME BECAUSE
13	WHEN WE GO INTO AND WE LOOK AT COUNCILMEMBER
KEHOE	
14	AND WHAT SHE SAID AT THE COMMITTEE MEETING BACK
IN	
15	JULY, IF WE LOOK AT A NEWSPAPER AND SEE WHAT

16	HAPPENED IN A NEWSPAPER, YOU KNOW, AND QUOTES
IN A	
17	NEWSPAPER, WE'RE SPECULATING AS TO WHY THOSE
18	STATEMENTS WERE MADE. I CAN, FOR EXAMPLE, WITH
19	COUNCILMEMBER KEHOE, WHY DID SHE MAKE THAT
20	STATEMENT IN THE COMMITTEE? I SUBMIT TO YOU IT
21	WASN'T BECAUSE OF THE LEA. SHE WASN'T RELYING
22	UPON, WELL, THE CITY IS NOW GOING TO BECOME THE
LEA	
23	AND HAVE THIS INCREDIBLE AMOUNT OF CONTROL.
SHE	
24	WASN'T RELYING UPON THAT. SHE DID MAKE THAT
25	STATEMENT, AND YOU WERE CORRECT IN ARTICULATING 182

- 1 WHAT SHE STATED AT THAT COMMITTEE FOR WHICH I
- 2 ATTENDED.
- 3 BUT WHEN WE LOOK AT THE

STATEMENTS

I

- 4 THAT YOU'VE INDICATED THAT PEOPLE MADE IN THE CITY
- 5 AND WE MAKE THE ASSUMPTION THAT IT'S BECAUSE THE
- 6 CITY THINKS BECAUSE WE'RE GOING TO BECOME AN LEA
- 7 THAT WE CAN DO THESE THINGS. AND THAT'S NOT THE
- 8 CASE. I THINK THAT'S INAPPROPRIATE. I REALLY DO.
- 9 I FEEL JUST AS PASSIONATE ABOUT THIS AS YOU DO, MR.
- 10 JONES. I REALLY BELIEVE THAT THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO
- 11 HAS MET THE CONDITIONS THAT ARE OUT THERE. AND
- 12 REALLY THINK THE FOCUS SHOULD BE ON 43200 AND THE
- 13 STAFF ISSUE THAT YOU ARE BRINGING UP. I THINK

14	THAT'S A REAL ISSUE. THAT'S WHAT NEEDS TO BE
15	DECIDED BY THIS BOARD. HAVE WE PUT STAFF
16	SUFFICIENT TO MEET THAT? IF WE HAVEN'T, WE
DON'T	
17	DESERVE TO BE DESIGNATED. WE DON'T AND YOU
HAVE	
18	THE POWER TO NOT DESIGNATE US, BUT WE BELIEVE
WE	
19	DO.
20	AND THE LAST POINT I WANT TO MAKE
IS	
21	BECAUSE, YOU KNOW, I'VE WORKED FOR THE CITY OF
SAN	
22	DIEGO IN THE CITY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE FOR THE
LAST	
23	TEN YEARS. THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO IS A GREAT
CITY.	
24	WHEN WE TELL YOU THAT WE'RE GOING TO FULFILL
THIS	
25	FUNCTION, WE WILL FULFILL THIS FUNCTION, WHETHER

IT

- 1 BE MY OFFICE IN PROVIDING LEGAL ADVICE OR WHETHER
- 2 IT BE THROUGH THE CITY MANAGER'S OFFICE. THIS IS A
- 3 GREAT CITY. IT'S A GREAT CITY, AND IT WILL DO WHAT
- 4 IT'S SUPPOSED TO DO AND IT WILL FUNCTION AS AN LEA.
 - 5 BOARD MEMBER JONES: MR. HEAP, I THINK
- 6 IT'S A GREAT CITY TOO, BELIEVE ME. I REALLY DO.
- 7 SPENT A LITTLE TIME IN SAN DIEGO WEARING A UNIFORM.
 - 8 BUT MY -- I THINK YOU ARE FULLY CAPABLE, BUT I
- 9 THINK THAT THE ISSUES -- AND I SAID IT AT

COMMITTEE

- 10 MEETING. I BROUGHT THE OTHER ISSUES UP, NOT TO
- BASE MY DECISION ON, BUT TO PAINT A PICTURE

OF

- 12 MISS -- OF THE CITY, WHETHER IT BE THE DECISION
- 13 MAKERS ON THE COUNCIL OR THE CITY MANAGER'S OFFICE

- 14 NOT FULLY COMPREHENDING WHAT THAT SEPARATION OF
- 15 POWER NEEDS TO BE. AND THAT'S -- AND THAT'S WHY

Ι

16 DID IT. THAT WAS THE ONLY REASON I DID IT THEN

AND

- 17 THAT'S WHY I DID IT AGAIN TODAY BECAUSE I DON'T
- 18 THINK THAT -- YOU KNOW, I THINK THEY'RE GETTING
- 19 THERE, BUT I'M NOT SURE THAT THEY UNDERSTAND

THAT

THE LEA ISN'T A TOOL THAT CAN BE USED TO KEEP

RATES

- 21 EQUALIZED.
- BUT WHEN I WAS TALKING TO MR.

CAREY,

WE HAVE -- I DON'T KNOW IF HE'S AWARE THAT

PORTER

- 24 DIDN'T SIGN OR NOT. I DON'T KNOW THAT. I JUST
- FOUND OUT WITHIN THE HOUR AND A HALF ABOUT THE 184

- 1 OTHER TWO. IF I KNEW EARLIER, I WOULD HAVE TOLD
- 2 YOU EARLIER. WHAT I'M SAYING IS YOU'RE DOWN TO 20
- 3 HOURS. YOU ARE GOING TO HAVE TO GO OUT AND GET
- 4 OTHER PEOPLE TO BE ABLE TO GET -- TO BE ABLE TO
- 5 FULFILL THE REQUIREMENTS OF 43200, PURE AND SIMPLE.
- 6 MY QUESTION IS IF WE -- AND I DON'T
- 7 CARE IF IT'S TO THE END OF THE FISCAL YEAR OR IF
- 8 IT'S TILL A MONTH FROM NOW UNTIL YOU CAN GET PEOPLE
- 9 IN PLACE. IF WE ARE THE EA AND WE CONTRACT WITH
- 10 THE COUNTY TO DO THOSE FUNCTIONS, TO BE ON-SITE,
- 11 WHICH WAS YOUR -- NOT YOUR PREFERRED, NOT THE
- PREFERRED METHOD, BUT A METHOD OF SATISFYING
- US,
- 13 AND I'M SURE WE CAN GET MR. CAREY INVOLVED IN
- 14 SOMETHING, I DON'T KNOW, BUT -- AND WOULDN'T

THAT

15 GIVE THE CITY THE TIME THAT IT NEEDED WITHOUT 16 DELAYING ANYTHING TO GO THROUGH THE TRANSITIONAL 17 PERIOD WITH REGULAR PEOPLE BECAUSE WHAT YOU ARE ASKING US TO DO, AND IT WAS THROUGH YOUR OWN 18 19 TESTIMONY AT THE COMMITTEE, IS YOU'RE ASKING US ΤO 20 CERTIFY A PROGRAM THAT NONE OF THE -- NONE OF THE21 PRINCIPALS WILL BE INVOLVED WITH IN SIX MONTHS. SO EVERYBODY THAT WE SEE HERE, EVERYTHING THAT IS 22 ΙN THAT MANUAL OTHER THAN THE CORE PROGRAMS AND THE 23 24 TRAINING AND THAT TYPE OF STUFF, BUT THE PEOPLE, 25 THE PARTICIPANTS THAT WE ARE GOING TO BE CERTIFYING

- 1 TODAY, IF, IN FACT, WE DO, AREN'T GOING TO BE THERE
 - 2 IN SIX MONTHS. THEY'RE NOT GOING TO BE THERE.
- 3 SOMEBODY ELSE IS GOING TO BE THERE. SO THEN WE GOT
- 4 TO GO THROUGH THIS AGAIN.
- 5 IF WE'RE THE EA AND YOU'RE
- 6 COMFORTABLE WITH THE FACT THAT THEY -- THE COUNTY
- 7 WOULD ANSWER TO US, OKAY, THEY'D ANSWER TO RALPH
- 8 AND TO THE BOARD AS TO PROVIDING THOSE FUNCTIONS,
- 9 IN THE TIME THAT IT TOOK YOU, YOUR SERVICE,
- 10 ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES PEOPLE, THE TIME THAT

ΙT

11 WOULD TAKE TO GET A COUPLE OF THE OTHER PIECES

ΙN

- 12 PLACE SO THAT YOU ARE NOT FACED WITH PEOPLE THAT
- 13 HAVE SIGNED LETTERS OF AGREEMENT AND THEN FOR
- 14 REASONS OUT OF THEIR CONTROL THEIR BOSS SAYS,

NO,

- 15 THEY'RE NOT GOING TO DO IT OR GERALD QUICK DECIDES
- 16 HE DOESN'T WANT TO WORK EIGHT HOURS, I MEAN EIGHT
- DAYS A MONTH, HE ONLY WANTS TO WORK TWO.
 BECAUSE
- 18 THE NEXT PERSON THAT LEAVES, IF THIS IS ACCURATE,
- 19 WHAT THE COUNTY TOLD ME, THE NEXT ONE THAT LEAVES,
- 20 UNLESS IT'S QUONG THAN, WHO'S ONLY GOING TO WORK
- TWO DAYS A MONTH, IS GOING TO BRING YOU DOWN TO
- 22 SOMEWHERE BELOW 18 DAYS A MONTH OF PEOPLE THAT ARE
- GOING TO BE THERE TO PROVIDE SERVICES IF ONE MORE
- LEAVES.
- I DON'T THINK THAT'S A GOOD PLACE

ТО

- 1 BE AS FAR AS GETTING THINGS DONE. BUT IF NOT
- 2 POSTPONING IT, BUT BEING THE EA AND CONTRACTING,
- 3 IF -- YOU KNOW, IF THAT'S AN OPTION THAT IS
- 4 REASONABLE TO YOU, THAT WOULD GIVE YOU THE TIME

FOR

5 MR. CAREY AND EVERYBODY TO PUT FULL-TIME PEOPLE

ΤO

- 6 YOU -- I DON'T KNOW. THAT'S WHY I ASKED YOU.
- 7 MR. CAREY: LET ME TRY TO ADDRESS THAT.
- 8 LIKE I SAY, THAT'S AN ELEMENT OF SURPRISE.

LIKE

- 9 YOU SAID, YOU VERBALLY HAVE GOTTEN THAT INFORMA-
- 10 TION. I HAVE THE COMMITMENT LETTER SIGNED BY THE
- 11 EMPLOYEES. OBVIOUSLY ANY EMPLOYEE, WHETHER IT'S A
- 12 BOARD STAFF EMPLOYEE OR ANYBODY, CAN WALK ANY
 TIME
- THEY WANT. I OBVIOUSLY WILL HAVE THAT CHALLENGE
 TO
- 14 BACKFILL THOSE KIND OF POSITIONS IF SOMEBODY DOES

15 THAT. I CAN TELL YOU WHEN YOU LOOK AT OUR TIME TASK ANALYSIS, AND THAT I THINK YOUR BOARD 16 STAFF 17 WILL BE ABLE TO LOOK AT THAT TOO, THAT A LOT OF 18 TIME THAT IS SET ASIDE FOR INSPECTORS AND CIVIL 19 ENGINEERS AND PROGRAM MANAGERS IS SPENT IN TRAINING 20 AND MEETINGS AND WHAT HAVE YOU, ANCILLARY TYPE OF 21 DUTIES AND NOT FULL INSPECTIONS. 22 WE ONLY HAVE THREE FACILITIES WITHIN THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO THAT NEED MONTHLY INSPEC-24 TIONS. SO WE CAN HAVE -- WE CAN HAVE THIS SORT OF 25 GIVE-AND-TAKE. IF SOMEBODY WAS TO LEAVE, WE 187

- 1 WOULDN'T HAVE TO SAY, "MY GOSH. WE NEED AN
- 2 INDIVIDUAL IMMEDIATELY IN ORDER TO MAKE THESE

THREE

- 3 INSPECTIONS THIS MONTH." I PERSONALLY HAVE THE
- 4 QUALIFICATIONS TO MAKE THOSE KINDS OF INSPECTIONS,
 - 5 CIVIL ENGINEER, WHO IS FULL TIME, HAS THAT. WE
- 6 HAVE TWO FULL-TIME STAFF THAT WILL BE REGARDLESS.
 - 7 I'M NOT WALKING AND THE CIVIL ENGINEER IS NOT
 - 8 WALKING. THEN WE BACKFILL WITH THOSE PART-TIME
 - 9 EMPLOYEES THAT YOU'VE JUST REFERRED TO.
- 10 I'M STILL NOT CONVINCED THAT THE
- 11 COUNTY IS GOING TO DIRECT THOSE EMPLOYEES THAT
- 12 THOSE ARE SOME SORT OF INCOMPATIBLE ACTIVITIES

THAT

13 THEY CAN'T PERFORM. AFTER HAVING GONE ALL THE

WAY

14 THROUGH THEIR PERSONNEL DEPARTMENT, AND I KNOW

IT'S

- 15 GONE THROUGH THE HUMAN RESOURCES DEPARTMENT AND
- 16 EVERYTHING, SO IF THAT HAPPENS, IT HAPPENS.

AND

JUST LIKE ANY EMPLOYEE WALKING ON ANYBODY, YOU

DO

- 18 THE BEST YOU CAN. YOU GET STAFF TO BACKFILL.
- 19 I LIKE THE SUGGESTION THAT MR.

FRAZEE

- 20 HAD AND MR. CHESBRO HAD. IF YOU ARE SO CONCERNED
- 21 ABOUT THIS, WE'RE ALREADY ON TEMPORARY CERTIFICA-
- 22 TION. PUTTING US ON PROBATION DOESN'T REALLY - I
- 23 MEAN IF THAT GIVES YOU SOME SORT OF FEELING THAT
- 24 YOU CAN DO SOMETHING QUICKLY AND STEP IN MORE
- 25 EFFICIENTLY, I'D BE HAPPY TO DO THAT. I THINK THAT

- 1 WHAT THIS BOARD SHOULD DO IS MOVE FORWARD WITH THE
- 2 CERTIFICATION. IF YOU WANT TO ASK YOUR EXECUTIVE
- 3 DIRECTOR TO DIRECT STAFF TO HELP US TO MAKE SURE
- 4 THAT WE'RE REALLY DOING THE WORK THAT NEEDS TO BE
- 5 DONE DOWN THERE, THEN DEDICATE YOUR ENFORCEMENT
- 6 STAFF TO ME, NOT TO THE COUNTY. DON'T KEEP THAT
- 7 JURISDICTION HERE. CONTINUE TO BE THE OVERSIGHT

OF

- 8 THIS WHOLE PROGRAM AT THE STATE LEVEL, GIVE ME
 THE
- 9 CERTIFICATION AT THE CITY, AND THEN LOAN ME
- 10 WHATEVER STAFF I MIGHT NEED THROUGH YOUR
- 11 ENFORCEMENT STAFF. THAT MAY BE ANOTHER COMPROMISE
- 12 THAT COULD BE WORKED OUT. WE'D BE HAPPY TO DISCUSS
- 13 THAT WITH YOU.
- 14 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: I THINK IF

THERE'S

15	NO FURTHER DISCUSSION, I'M READY TO ENTERTAIN A
16	MOTION.
17	BOARD MEMBER JONES: I'D
18	BOARD MEMBER FRAZEE: MR. CHAIRMAN, I
19	WOULD MOVE ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION 97-508.
20	BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: I'LL SECOND IT.
21	BOARD MEMBER JONES: MR. CHAIRMAN.
22	BOARD MEMBER GOTCH: LET'S SEE. THIS
23	IS I'D LIKE TO INCLUDE IN THE MOTION THEN,
IF I	
24	MAY ASK THIS OF THE MOTION MAKER, THAT WE
INCLUDE	
25	THE SUGGESTION THAT MR. CHESBRO HAD MADE WITH
THE	100
	189

- 1 EVALUATION UPDATES, THAT STAFF WOULD DESIGNATE
- HOW
 - 2 MANY, HOW OFTEN AS WE DISCUSSED EARLIER.
 - 3 BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: BASICALLY

REPORT

- 4 BACK TO THE COMMITTEE IF -- THE P&E COMMITTEE ON
- 5 STATUS AND PROGRESS OF THE LEA.
- 6 BOARD MEMBER FRAZEE: I WAS USING,

PERHAPS

- 7 NOT CORRECTLY, BUT INTERCHANGEABLY THE WORDS
- 8 "TEMPORARY" AND "PROBATIONARY" IN THE SAME
- CONTEXT.
- 9 AND THE RESOLUTION DOES INDICATE TEMPORARY.
- 10 BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: OKAY. AND I WAS
- 11 TRYING TO INCREASE THE COMFORT LEVEL OF THE

BOARD

- 12 MEMBERS WHO STILL AREN'T QUITE THERE. SO I
- DON'T
- 13 KNOW THERE'S ANYTHING ELSE WE COULD ADD TO IT

THAT

- 14 WOULD --
- 15 BOARD MEMBER FRAZEE: AS THE MAKER OF

THE

- 16 MOTION, I HAVE NO PROBLEM WITH PERIODIC REPORT
- BACKS ON PROGRESS BEING MADE, AND I'LL INCLUDE

THAT

- 18 IN THE MOTION.
- BOARD MEMBER JONES: MR. CHAIRMAN,

FOR

- 20 SOME DISCUSSION BEFORE I MAKE A SUBSTITUTE MOTION.
- 21 THERE'S NO WAY THAT ANY PERIODIC REVIEW IS GOING TO
- 22 TELL YOU WHEN THIS DOCUMENT IS IN A PROCESS.

IF I

- 23 SUBMIT A PERMIT TO AN LEA, WE ARE NOT GOING TO KNOW
- 24 WHERE IT IS IN THE PROCESS, WHOSE DESK IT'S SITTING
- ON, OR HOW LONG IT HAS BEEN SINCE IT HAS BEEN 190

- 1 ADDRESSED. INSPECTIONS ARE THE LEAST OF WHAT AN
- 2 LEA DOES. IT IS THE BOOKWORK, IT IS THE HEARINGS,
- 3 IT IS THE PANELS, IT IS THOSE TYPES OF THINGS
 THAT
 - 4 AN LEA STAFF HAS TO BE AVAILABLE FOR.
- 5 THE INSPECTIONS HAPPEN ONCE A MONTH.
- 6 THIS STUFF GOES ON EVERY DAY, AND RIGHT NOW THEY'VE
- 7 GOT A STAFF OF 20 HOURS. AND THAT -- I DON'T KNOW
 - 8 HOW WE CAN QUANTIFY THAT THAT DOCUMENT IS GOING
- 9 THROUGH. IF THERE WAS A PLACE, BELIEVE ME,
- Ι'D
- 10 HAVE FOUND IT A LOT YEARS AGO WHERE I COULD FIND
- 11 OUT WHERE SOME OF MY DOCUMENTS WERE IN THE PROCESS,
- 12 BUT THEY NEVER SEEM TO KNOW. AND MY PROBLEM WOULD
- BE IF WE SENT SOMEBODY DOWN THERE AND, GOD FORBID,

- 14 MR. CAREY WAS OUT AT A SITE AND IT WAS ONE OF THOSE
- 15 TWO DAYS THAT NOBODY WAS IN THE OFFICE, WE'D HAVE
- 16 TO SPEND THE NIGHT ANYWAY TO WAIT AND FIND OUT
- 17 WHERE THAT THING IS.
- 18 SO I WOULD LIKE TO MAKE A

SUBSTITUTE

- 19 MOTION. MY SUBSTITUTE MOTION WOULD BE THAT WE
- 20 DISAPPROVE THE EPP, NOT ISSUE -- OKAY. HOW

ABOUT

- 21 THIS, THAT WE NOT ISSUE THE REQUEST FOR CERTIFICA-
- 22 TION AND, THEREFORE, DISAPPROVE THE DESIGNATION,
- 23 AND THAT THE BOARD WILL SERVE AS THE ENFORCEMENT
- 24 AGENT FOR THE JURISDICTION UNTIL THE CITY CAN BRING
- FORWARD A, AS THEY HAD ALREADY PROJECTED, A
 191

- 1 FULL-TIME STAFF IN JUNE OR JULY. AND IF YOU WANT,
- 2 I WILL PUT IN THERE THAT WE WILL -- IF THE CITY
- 3 COMFORTABLE, WE'LL CONTRACT WITH MR. CAREY OR THE
- 4 COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO -- I THINK I BETTER SAY THE
- 5 COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO, AND WE'LL SEE WHAT WE CAN
- 6 ABOUT MR. CAREY. THAT'S MY MOTION.
- 7 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: JUST TO GET IT
- TO A

DO

IS

- 8 VOTE, I'LL SECOND IT. I'M NOT SURE WE NEED
 THAT
- 9 BECAUSE IF WE DENY THE OTHER ONE, GETTING THE SAME
- 10 THING. BUT ANY DISCUSSION?
- BOARD MEMBER FRAZEE: YES, JUST ON MR.
- 12 JONES' CONCERN ABOUT, AND I SHARE HIS CONCERN
- ABOUT
- 13 MOVING PERMIT ACTIVITY ALONG IN AN APPROPRIATE
- MANNER. I HAVE NOT HEARD, I DON'T THINK THERE
- ARE
- 15 ANY PERMITS PENDING IN THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO

OVER	O	V	Έ	R
------	---	---	---	---

- 16 THE NEXT SIX OR SEVEN MONTHS THAT WOULD AFFECT
- THAT
- 17 ANYWAY. I DON'T THINK THAT THERE IS A PENDING
- 18 MAJOR WORKLOAD IN THE PERMIT SECTION COMING UP

ΙN

- 19 SAN DIEGO COUNTY.
- 20 BOARD MEMBER JONES: I'M NOT SURE THERE
- 21 IS, BUT THE CITY MANAGER OR MR. CONRAD MADE

SURE

- 22 THAT IT WAS A CONDITION THAT THE COUNTY
- WOULDN'T
- 23 PUT ANY OF THEM THROUGH, SO THAT -- WITHOUT

HIS

- 24 PERMISSION, SO I WORRY ABOUT THAT.
- 25 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: OKAY. IF

THERE'S NO

1 FURTHER DISCUSSION, LET'S TAKE THE FIRST VOTE
ON
2 THE SUBSTITUTE MOTION. SECRETARY WILL CALL
THE
3 ROLL.
4 THE SECRETARY: BOARD MEMBER
CHESBRO.
5 BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: NO.
6 THE SECRETARY: FRAZEE.
7 BOARD MEMBER FRAZEE: NO.
8 THE SECRETARY: GOTCH.
9 BOARD MEMBER GOTCH: AYE.
10 THE SECRETARY: JONES.
BOARD MEMBER JONES: AYE.
12 THE SECRETARY: RELIS.
BOARD MEMBER RELIS: NO.
14 THE SECRETARY: CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON.
15 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: AYE. THAT MEANS
16 THE MOTION FAILS THOUGH. OKAY. NOW WE'LL MOVE
TO
17 THE MAIN MOTION, MR. FRAZEE'S MOTION. IF YOU
WILL

18

CALL THE ROLL ON THAT.

19	THE SECRETARY: BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO.
20	BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: AYE.
21	THE SECRETARY: FRAZEE.
22	BOARD MEMBER FRAZEE: AYE.
23	THE SECRETARY: GOTCH.
24	BOARD MEMBER GOTCH: AYE.
25	THE SECRETARY: JONES. 193

Τ	BOARD MEMBER JONES: NO.
2	THE SECRETARY: RELIS.
3	BOARD MEMBER RELIS: AYE.
4	THE SECRETARY: CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON.
5	CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: NO. MOTION
6	CARRIES.
7	WE WILL NOW MOVE TO ITEM 26. ITEM
26	
8	WAS ON THE CONSENT CALENDAR. WE PULLED IT FROM
9	THE
10	BOARD MEMBER JONES: CAN I ASK A
QUESTI	ON,
11	MR. CHAIRMAN, ON THIS. IT'S PROBATIONARY,
CORREC'	T?
12	WE ARE NOT ISSUING CERTIFICATION PERMANENTLY.
13	MR. UNSELL: IT IS THE TEMPORARY
14	CERTIFICATION.
15	BOARD MEMBER JONES: COME BACK IN FRONT
OF	
16	THIS BOARD PRIOR TO ANY PERMANENT CERTIFICATION
17	STATUS?
18	MR. UNSELL: TYPICALLY IN THE PAST FOR
19	TEMPORARY CERTIFICATION, AT THE END OF THE
20	TEMPORARY TIME FRAME THERE IS AN EVALUATION DONE

21	FOR COMPLIANCE OF THE REGULATORY AND STATUTORY
22	REQUIREMENTS. AND IF THOSE HAVE BEEN COMPLIED
23	WITH, THEN THOSE ARE BROUGHT BACK AS A FULL
24	CERTIFICATION TO THE P&E COMMITTEE.
25	BOARD MEMBER JONES: IT COMES TO THE 194

1 COMMITTEE. 2 MR. UNSELL: CORRECT. THERE'S NOTHING 3 THAT PRECLUDES ANY TRIGGER POINTS FOR US TO DETECT 4 FOR AN EARLIER EVALUATION SHOULD THERE BE 5 INCONSISTENCIES IN APPLICATION FROM THE LEA. CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: OKAY. OKAY. MOVING 7 ON TO -- ITEM 26 WAS ON THE CONSENT CALENDAR. WE PULLED IT OFF BECAUSE A MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC HAD 8 INDICATED THAT HE WOULD LIKE THAT AND THEY WOULD ΒE 10 HERE. MR. SUNSWHEAT IS NOT HERE. HE NOTIFIED HE11 WOULD NOT BE HERE. SO WE CAN GO INTO IT 12 FULL-BLOWN. I THINK THERE WAS BOARD INTEREST IN 13 SOME COMMENTS OR SOMETHING. IS THAT RIGHT, MR. 14 CHESBRO? 15 BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: I HAD A COMMENT Ι 16 WAS GOING TO MAKE BEFORE WE VOTED ON IT. I

WASN'T

17	GOING	ТО	PROPOSE	ANYTHING	OTHER	THAN
RECOMM:	ENDA-					

- 18 TION.
- 19 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: I THINK WE'RE
- 20 PREPARED TO VOTE ON IT SINCE IT WAS ON CONSENT
- 21 UNLESS SOMEBODY WANTS A STAFF.
- BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: I DON'T THINK
- THAT'S NECESSARY. CAN I JUST SAY, WHILE I

REALIZE

24 THIS IS VERY GENERAL AUTHORITY ITEM THAT RECOGNIZES

25 THE BOARD'S ABILITY TO REGULATE THE WASTESTREAM, I

- 1 DID HAVE SOME ISSUES REGARDING THE DEFINITION OF
- 2 INERT AS WELL AS THE MINING RECLAMATION LANGUAGE.
- 3 AND I'D JUST LIKE TO LET OUR STAFF KNOW THAT I'M
- 4 CONCERNED ABOUT A DEFINITION OF INERT THAT COULD
- 5 INCLUDE WASTE TIRES, AND I WOULD NOT LIKE TO SEE
- 6 MINE RECLAMATION TURN INTO SHAM DISPOSAL, IF YOU
- 7 WILL.

TO

JUST

- 8 THE WORST CASE WOULD BE FOR TIRES
- 9 BE CONSIDERED INERT AND HAVE THEM DUMPED AT A MINE
- 10 SITE UNDER THE GUISE OF RECLAMATION. SO JUST KIND
- OF WANTED TO GET THAT OUT THERE ON THE RECORD
- 12 BEFORE WE PROCEEDED. I KNOW THAT IT'S OPEN TO
- 13 INTERPRETATION AND QUESTION AT THIS POINT, BUT
- 14 WANTED TO EXPRESS THAT CONCERN.

- 15 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: AND I -- THE
- CHAIR
- 16 WHOLEHEARTEDLY AGREES WITH YOU. I WAS CONCERNED
- 17 ABOUT THAT ISSUE TOO, THAT WE ARE MINDFUL THAT

WE

- 18 DON'T CREATE SOMEPLACE, AN OPEN HOLE THAT PEOPLE
- ARE JUST THROWING TIRES INTO AND WE COULD HAVE

Α

- 20 SMOKESTACK THERE. MR. JONES.
- BOARD MEMBER JONES: MR. CHAIRMAN, I

AGREE

- 22 WITH YOU, BOTH OF YOU. OKAY. BUT I'M WONDERING,
- 23 TIRES ARE INERT BY DEFINITION THROUGHOUT FEDERAL
- 24 AND EVERYTHING. SO I THINK ONE OF THE

MECHANISMS

25 HAS TO BE IS THAT WE IDENTIFY IT SEPARATELY.

YOU

1 KNOW WHAT I MEAN? BECAUSE I DON'T THINK WE WANT

TO

2 GET INTO THE HABIT OF REDEFINING WHAT THE REST

OF

- 3 THE WORLD KNOWS IS INERT.
- 4 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: I THINK THAT'S

WHAT

5 WE'RE ASKING STAFF, TO MAKE SURE WE UNDERSTAND

WHAT

- 6 THAT IS. THEREFORE, THERE BEING NO FURTHER
- 7 DISCUSSION, LET'S HAVE THE SECRETARY CALL THE

ROLL

- 8 ON THAT.
- 9 BOARD MEMBER RELIS: I'LL MOVE IT.
- 10 CONSIDERATION OF THE LEGAL AUTHORITY AND STAFF
- 11 OPTIONS RELATED TO CONSTRUCTION, DEMOLITION,

INERT

- 12 TIER REGULATIONS.
- 13 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: SECOND.

SECRETARY

- 14 CALL THE ROLL.
- THE SECRETARY: BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO.
- BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: AYE.
- 17 THE SECRETARY: FRAZEE.

18	BOARD MEMBER FRAZEE: AYE.
19	THE SECRETARY: GOTCH.
20	BOARD MEMBER GOTCH: AYE.
21	THE SECRETARY: JONES.
22	BOARD MEMBER JONES: AYE.
23	THE SECRETARY: RELIS.
24	BOARD MEMBER RELIS: AYE.
25	THE SECRETARY: CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON. 197

1	CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: AYE. MOTION
2	CARRIES.
3	MOVE TO ITEM 29, UPDATE ON STAFF'S
4	EFFORTS TO DEVELOP NO, WELL, WE MISSED ONE
HERE,	
5	DIDN'T WE?
6	ITEM 29, UPDATE ON THE STAFF'S
7	EFFORTS TO DEVELOP QUANTITATIVE MEASUREMENT
TOOLS	
8	FOR USE BY LOCAL JURISDICTIONS. JUDY
FRIEDM	AN.
9	MS. FRIEDMAN: GOOD AFTERNOON,
CHAIRM	AN
10	PENNINGTON AND BOARD MEMBERS. STAFF PRESENTED
AN	
11	UPDATE ON THE PROGRESS OF A SYSTEM TOOL
DEVELO	PMENT
12	TO THE LOCAL ASSISTANCE AND PLANNING COMMITTEE
IN	
13	OCTOBER. AT THAT TIME STAFF WAS DIRECTED BY THE
14	COMMITTEE TO PRESENT THIS UPDATE TO THE BOARD
SO	
15	THAT THE BOARD COULD BE APPRISED OF SOME OF
THE	

16	TOOLS THAT WE HAVE BEEN WORKING ON AND THEIR
17	STATUS.
18	STAFF WILL NOW PROVIDE AN UPDATE
ON A	
19	COUPLE OF THE TOOLS, THE DIVERSION STUDY GUIDE
AND	
20	THE WASTE CHARACTERIZATION DATABASE. AND NANCY
21	CARR AND CHRIS SCHMIDLE WILL MAKE THE
PRESEN'	TATION
22	FOR STAFF.
23	MR. SCHMIDLE: GOOD AFTERNOON, CHAIRMAN
24	AND BOARD MEMBERS. ONE OF THE WASTE
CHARAC'	TERI-
25	ZATION AND ANALYSIS BRANCH'S FUNCTIONS IS TO

198

1	DEVELOP QUANTITATIVE TOOLS TO HELP
JURISD	DICTIONS
2	IMPROVE THE WASTE MEASUREMENT SYSTEMS. TWO
3	PRINCIPAL TOOLS ARE CURRENTLY UNDER DEVELOPMENT
ВҮ	
4	THE BRANCH, A DIVERSION MEASUREMENT GUIDE AND A
5	WASTE CHARACTERIZATION DATABASE.
6	STAFF'S PRESENTATION THIS
AFTERN	IOON
7	CONSISTS OF A BRIEF DESCRIPTION AND DEVELOPMENT
8	PROGRESS UPDATE BY THE PROJECT MANAGER FOR EACH
OF	
9	THE NEW TOOLS, AND STAFF ARE HERE TO GIVE YOU
AN	
10	OPPORTUNITY TO ASK ANY QUESTIONS YOU MAY HAVE
ABOUT	
11	THE PROJECTS AND THE INTENDED PRODUCTS.
12	I'D LIKE TO START WITH THE REPORT
ON	
13	THE DIVERSION MEASUREMENT GUIDE. MANY JURISDIC-
14	TIONS HAVE TOLD STAFF THAT THEY EXPERIENCE
GREAT	

15 DIFFICULTY AND COSTS WHILE PERFORMING THE

W	Α	S	٦	7	E
V V	$\boldsymbol{\tau}$	\sim		_	Ľ

- 16 DIVERSION ESTIMATION PORTION OF THEIR 1990
- 17 BASE-YEAR SOLID WASTE GENERATION STUDIES AND

THAT

- 18 THE RESULTS OBTAINED FROM THE STUDIES OFTEN SEEM TO
- 19 UNDERCOUNT THEIR ACTUAL DIVERSION TONNAGE.
 BECAUSE
- 20 OF THIS AND OTHER TYPES OF DATA MEASUREMENT ERRORS,
- 21 SOME JURISDICTIONS WOULD LIKE TO ESTABLISH NEW AND
- 22 MORE ACCURATE BASE-YEAR WASTE GENERATION TONNAGE
- NUMBERS USING DATA FROM THE BOARD'S DISPOSAL
- 24 REPORTING SYSTEM AND THE RESULTS OF A NEW DIVERSION
- 25 STUDY.

- 1 OTHER JURISDICTIONS FEEL THAT IT
- 2 WOULD BE MORE ACCURATE FOR THEM TO CALCULATE

THEIR

3 DIVERSION RATE BY TRACKING THEIR GENERATION ON

AN

4 ANNUAL BASIS. IN BOTH CASES JURISDICTIONS AND

THE

5 WASTE HAULERS HAVE ASKED BOARD STAFF FOR

ASSISTANCE

- 6 AND ADVICE ON BETTER WAYS TO ESTIMATE THEIR
- 7 DIVERSION TONNAGE. DR. EUGENE TSENG OF UCLA HAS
- 8 BEEN WORKING WITH STAFF SINCE EARLY 1996 TO

ANALYZE

9 THE PROBLEMS ENCOUNTERED BY JURISDICTIONS AND

THE

- 10 WASTE INDUSTRY IN THEIR BASE-YEAR GENERATION
- 11 STUDIES. BASED ON HIS RESEARCH, DR. TSENG AND I
- 12 ARE NOW DEVELOPING A WASTE DIVERSION

MEASUREMENT

13 GUIDE WHICH WILL ADDRESS SOME OF THE

IDENTIFIED

- 14 DATA PROBLEMS.
- 15 THE GUIDE IS A TECHNICAL

ASSISTANCE

- 16 DOCUMENT AIMED PRIMARILY AT THE JURISDICTION STAFF.
- 17 IT WILL ASSIST THEM TO GENERALLY UNDERSTAND WHAT
- 18 DIVERTED MATERIALS CONSIST OF AND HOW TO FIND

AND

- 19 QUANTIFY THE MATERIALS. IT WILL ALSO HELP
- JURISDICTIONS EVALUATE THE QUALITY OF THEIR
- 21 EXISTING DIVERSION DATA, REPAIR OR SUPPLEMENT

THE

- DATA, IF POSSIBLE, AND DETERMINE WHETHER AN
- 23 ENTIRELY NEW DIVERSION MEASUREMENT STUDY IS
- NEEDED.
- 24 IF THE NEW DIVERSION STUDY IS INDICATED, THE GUIDE
- 25 WILL HELP THEM DEVELOP A MORE CURRENT TONNAGE DATA

- 1 THAT WILL GIVE FULL CREDIT FOR ALL THE JURISDIC-
 - 2 TION'S DIVERSION ACTIVITIES.
 - 3 SPECIFICALLY, THE GUIDE

ADDRESSES

- 4 WHAT DR. TSENG BELIEVES TO BE THE THREE MOST
- 5 SIGNIFICANT DIVERSION QUANTIFICATION

PROBLEMS:

- 6 IDENTIFYING MISSING SOURCES OF DIVERSION DATA,
- 7 DEVELOPING MORE ACCURATE ESTIMATES OF THE TONNAGE,
 - 8 AND PROPERLY DOCUMENTING THE DIVERSION PROGRAM
- 9 RESULTS.
- 10 THE GUIDE CONTAINS DIVERSION

SURVEY

- 11 MANAGEMENT TECHNIQUES, DATA COLLECTION STRATEGIES
- 12 TO MINIMIZE TIME AND LABOR COSTS, CONVERSION
- 13 FORMULAS, AND RULES OF THUMB FOR MAKING TONNAGE
- 14 ESTIMATES, CASE STUDIES FROM OTHER JURISDICTIONS,

15	REPRODUCIBLE MODEL FORMS FOR DATA COLLECTION,
AND	
16	COPIES OF BOARD REGULATIONS ON DIVERSION.
17	ALTHOUGH THE PRIMARY FOCUS OF
THE	
18	GUIDE WILL BE TO DEVELOP MORE ACCURATE BASE-
YEAR	
19	DATA FOR CALCULATING DIVERSION RATES, THE
20	COLLECTION OF NEW DATA WILL HAVE ADDITIONAL
21	BENEFITS. DIVERSION AUDITS ARE A MAJOR TOOL
FOR	
22	EDUCATING BUSINESSES ABOUT THE ABILITY OF
SOURCE	
23	REDUCTION PROGRAMS TO SAVE MONEY. DIVERSION
SURVEY	
24	PLANNING WILL STIMULATE LOCAL STAFF TO REANALYZE
25	EXISTING PROGRAM RESULTS AND THINK OF NEW WAYS
TO	201

1 INCREASE DIVERSION TONNAGE. 2 NEW DIVERSION DATA DERIVED FROM ONE LOCAL SOURCE CAN OFTEN BE USED AS A MODEL TO INFLUENCE OTHER SIMILAR BUSINESSES. THE FIRST DRAFT OF THE GUIDE WILL BE CIRCULATED FOR COMMENT 6 INSIDE THE BOARD AND THEN TO A REVIEW GROUP OF 7 JURISDICTION AND INDUSTRY REPRESENTATIVES. THE 8 FINAL PUBLIC VERSION WILL BE AVAILABLE THIS WINTER 9 AND BE PLACED ON THE BOARD'S PUBLIC ACCESS WEB SITE 10 IN THE SPRING OF '98. 11 THAT ENDS MY FORMAL PRESENTATION. DO 12 YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS ABOUT THE PROJECT? 13 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: QUESTIONS? 14 QUESTIONS? 15 BOARD MEMBER RELIS: JUST BASED ON WHAT I 16 HEAR OUT THERE, GOOD LUCK. WE NEED TO CLOSE SOME

OF THOSE DEBATES OVER THE -- THAT HAVE, I

CIT.	JΕ	S	S	
\sim \sim	,	\sim	\sim	

- 18 HAVE DOGGED THE WHOLE EFFORT OVER THE LAST FEW
- 19 YEARS. IF YOU CAN DO IT WITH THIS SET OF
- TOOLS,
- THIS WOULD HELP THE BOARD IMMENSELY.
- MR. SCHMIDLE: WE'RE GOING TO TRY.
- THERE'S A CONSIDERABLE INTEREST IN THIS GUIDE
- 23 ALREADY.
- BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: THE THING I'M
- 25 PLEASED ABOUT, MR. CHAIRMAN, IS WE'VE SPENT

QUITE A

- 1 BIT OF TIME DEVELOPING THIS DATABASE AND PROCESS,
 - 2 AND IT'S NOW BEING MADE ACCESSIBLE AND BEING
- 3 MARKETED, IF YOU WILL, OR PUT OUT THERE IN A WAY
- 4 THAT WILL BE VERY USABLE. AND I'VE BEEN A LITTLE
- 5 BIT IMPATIENT WITH THAT AND WONDERING WHEN WE WERE
- 6 GOING TO FINALLY PUT IT IN A FORM THAT IT WOULD BE
- 7 REALLY ACCESSIBLE. AND I THINK THAT WE'VE GOTTEN
- 8 TO THAT POINT OR WE'RE VERY CLOSE TO IT, I SHOULD
- 9 SAY. IT'S NOT ACTUALLY COMPLETELY THERE YET,
 BUT
- 10 THIS IS A REPORT ON THAT VERY, VERY IMPORTANT
- 11 STEP.
- 12 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: VERY GOOD.
- MR. SCHMIDLE: I'D NOW LIKE TO

INTRODUCE

- 14 MISS CARR, WHO WILL OUTLINE HER PROGRESS IN
- 15 DEVELOPING THE DISPOSAL CHARACTERIZATION

DA	TA	BZ	2.2	\mathbf{E}	

- 16 MS. CARR: THE WASTE CHARACTERIZATION
- 17 DATABASE WAS DEVELOPED AS PART OF THE UNIFORM
- WASTE
- 18 DISPOSAL CHARACTERIZATION METHOD, WHICH JURISDIC-
- 19 TIONS WILL USE TO DEVELOP WASTESTREAM DATA. THE
- 20 STATUTE MANDATED THAT THE BOARD DEVELOP THIS
- METHOD.
- THE METHOD ALLOWS JURISDICTIONS TO
- USE DEFAULT DATA FROM THE DATABASE TO PREPARE
- WASTE
- 24 CHARACTERIZATION STUDIES. THE COMMERCIAL SECTOR
- 25 DATABASE COMBINES TWO TYPES OF

INFORMATION. ONE,

203

- 1 DATA ON THE TYPES AND AMOUNTS OF MATERIALS
- 2 TYPICALLY DISPOSED BY BUSINESSES; AND, TWO,
- 3 INFORMATION ON THE NUMBERS AND TYPES OF BUSINESSES
 - 4 IN THE LOCAL JURISDICTION.
 - 5 STAFF IS ADDING TO ADD

RESIDENTIAL

- 6 WASTESTREAM DATA TO THE DATABASE AND TO HAVE THE
- 7 ENTIRE DATABASE AVAILABLE ON THE BOARD'S WEB SITE
- 8 BY EARLY 1998. AT PRESENT THE DATABASE CAN PROVIDE
- 9 OVERVIEW INFORMATION ON THE COMMERCIAL SECTOR TO
- 10 USERS ON THE WEB SITE.
- 11 I'D LIKE TO SHOW YOU TWO THINGS
- 12 TODAY. FIRST I'LL SHOW YOU WHAT'S AVAILABLE

RIGHT

NOW TO JURISDICTIONS ON THE BOARD'S WEB SITE,

AND

T 4	THEN I LL SHOW TOO OUR IN-HOUSE VERSION OF THE
15	DATABASE THAT'S IN MICROSOFT ACCESS. AND
THAT	
16	INCLUDES MORE DETAILED INFORMATION THAT WILL
BE	
17	ADDED TO THE WEB SITE.
18	IF I MESS UP ON THE COMPUTER,
FORGIV	E
19	ME. THE FIRST SCREEN IS THE FIRST DATABASE
SCREEN	
20	JURISDICTIONS CAN ACCESS ON THE WEB SITE. AND
THE	
21	DATABASE CAN BE FOUND FROM THE BOARD'S HOME PAGE
22	UNDER DATABASES. SO THE FIRST STEP IN USING
THIS	
23	FOR A JURISDICTION IS TO SELECT A JURISDICTION
TO	
24	ANALYZE. AND FOR MY EXAMPLE I'LL CHOOSE OAKLAND
IN	
25	ALAMEDA COUNTY. SO OVER ON THE LEFT-HAND SIDE 204

- 1 SCREEN, YOU CAN SELECT A JURISDICTION.
- THERE'S OAKLAND. AND YOU CAN LOOK

 AT

- 3 DATA FOR OAKLAND IN TWO WAYS. FIRST, YOU CAN
- 4 AT OVERALL DATA BY BUSINESS GROUPING AND OVERALL
- 5 DATA BY MATERIAL TYPE. SO FIRST I'M GOING TO

LOOK

LOOK

- 6 AT IT BY BUSINESS GROUPING, SO I HIT THE SUBMIT
- 7 BUTTON ON THE RIGHT. AND THIS SHOWS A TABLE OF

THE

- 8 OVERALL BUSINESS SECTOR FOR THE CITY OF OAKLAND.
- 9 ON THE LEFT IS A LISTING OF BUSINESS GROUPINGS.
- 10 THE NEXT COLUMN LISTS THE NUMBER OF COMPANIES

IN

11 EACH OF THOSE BUSINESS GROUPINGS. THE NEXT

COLUMN

- 12 OVER LISTS NUMBERS OF EMPLOYEES IN EACH OF THE
- 13 BUSINESS GROUPINGS, AND THE LAST COLUMN ON

THE

14 RIGHT LISTS AN ESTIMATE OF THE AMOUNT

DISPOSED BY

15 EACH OF THOSE BUSINESS GROUPINGS. SO FROM

IHIS	
16	SCREEN A CITY CAN IDENTIFY RIGHT AWAY WHO THE
17	BIGGEST DISPOSERS ARE FROM THEIR COMMERCIAL
SECTOR	
18	THE NEXT WAY TO LOOK AT THE DATA
IS	
19	BY MATERIAL TYPE RATHER THAN BY BUSINESS
GROUPI	NG.
20	SO THIS TABLE LISTS WHAT THE COMMERCIAL SECTOR
21	WASTESTREAM WOULD LOOK LIKE FOR THE CITY OF
OAKLAN	TD
22	BASED ON ESTIMATES FROM THE DATABASE. AND FROM
23	THIS YOU CAN IDENTIFY THE LARGEST MATERIAL TYPES
24	DISPOSED BY THE COMMERCIAL SECTOR. WE'RE GOING
TO	
25	BE ADDING MORE DETAILED INFORMATION TO THE WEB

205

- 1 SITE, SO THAT'S WHAT I'M GOING TO SHOW YOU RIGHT
- NOW FROM OUR ACCESS VERSION OF THE DATABASE.
- 3 ONCE YOU KNOW WHAT THE BUSINESS
- 4 GROUPINGS ARE THAT ARE THE BIGGEST DISPOSERS,

THEN

- 5 YOU WANT TO KNOW THE TYPES AND AMOUNTS OF MATERIALS
- 6 FROM THAT SECTOR. SO WHAT THIS SCREEN LETS YOU DO
- 7 IS CHOOSE ONE OF THE BUSINESS GROUPINGS AND LOOK AT
 - 8 THE BREAKDOWN OF MATERIALS DISPOSED BY THAT
- 9 GROUPING. SO THE BUSINESS GROUPING I CHOSE IS
- 10 RESTAURANTS, AND THIS JUST LISTS THE MATERIAL TYPES
- 11 DISPOSED AND THE ESTIMATED TONNAGE DISPOSED BY
- 12 RESTAURANTS IN OAKLAND, AND THEN THE

FARTHEST

- 13 COLUMN OVER IS THE PERCENT. SO THE VERY -
- 14 BOARD MEMBER GOTCH: NANCY, IS IT

POSSIBLE

15 TO MAKE THIS A LITTLE DARKER? WE SAW THIS

\mathbf{T}	-	 пт	ιR

- 16 IN COMMITTEE.
- 17 MS. CARR: IT'S HARD TO SEE. YOU CAN

LOOK

- 18 AT THE MATERIALS EITHER KIND OF GROUPED BY ALL
- 19 PAPER TOGETHER, ALL METAL TOGETHER, OR YOU CAN

LOOK

- 20 AT IT BY LARGEST TO SMALLEST.
- 21 AND ON THE WEB SITE PEOPLE WILL BE
- 22 ABLE TO SORT DIFFERENT WAYS TOO TO GET

DIFFERENT

23 KINDS OF REPORTS AND PRINTOUTS. SO THIS

LISTS

24 MATERIAL TYPES LARGEST TO SMALLEST. THE ONE AT

THE

TOP IS FOOD, WHICH IS WHAT YOU WOULD EXPECT

FROM

206

- 1 RESTAURANTS THAT'S DISPOSED IN THE GREATEST AMOUNT.
- 2 I HAVE ONE MORE SCREEN TO SHOW YOU,
- 3 WHICH IS ANOTHER WAY TO APPROACH THE WASTESTREAM.
- 4 YOU MAY WANT TO FOCUS ON A MATERIAL TYPE AND FIND
 - 5 OUT WHAT BUSINESS GROUPINGS DISPOSE OF THAT THE
 - 6 MOST. SO FROM THIS SCREEN, I'M JUST GOING TO
- 7 CHOOSE UNCOATED CORRUGATED CARDBOARD, AND

DATABASE

- 8 WILL ESTIMATE HOW MUCH TONNAGE OF THAT MATERIAL
- 9 TYPE IS DISPOSED BY EACH BUSINESS GROUPING.
- 10 SO YOU CAN SEE FOR UNCOATED
- 11 CORRUGATED CARDBOARD, YOU CAN DETERMINE WHICH
- 12 BUSINESS GROUPINGS ARE ESTIMATED TO DISPOSE OF

THAT

- 13 IN THE GREATEST QUANTITY.
- 14 OKAY. SO THESE TWO SCREENS I JUST
- 15 SHOWED YOU WILL BE ADDED WITH RESIDENTIAL DATA

ТО

- 16 THE WEB SITE. WE'RE SHOOTING FOR EARLY '98.
- 17 I WANTED TO MENTION TOO THAT THIS

18	TOOL AND ANOTHER TOOL THAT WE'RE DEVELOPING IN
OUR	
19	BRANCH ARE GOING TO BE PRESENTED AT A COUPLE OF
20	WORKSHOPS THAT THE BOARD IS COSPONSORING WITH
U.S.	
21	EPA WITH A SOURCE REDUCTION ESTIMATION TOOL
THAT	
22	THEY'RE PRESENTING. SO THERE WILL BE A WORKSHOP
IN	
23	NORTHERN CALIFORNIA AND ONE IN SOUTHERN
CALIFO:	RNIA
24	AND INCLUDE THESE TOOLS. NEXT MONTH.
25	CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: OKAY. 207

- 1 MS. CARR: ANY QUESTIONS?
- 2 BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: JUST VERY

EXCITING.

- 3 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: IT IS EXCELLENT.
- 4 THANK YOU.
- 5 MS. FRIEDMAN: IF I COULD, I JUST

WANTED

6 TO ADD ONE THING. THE DATA -- THE IMPORTANCE

OF

7 THE DATA CAN'T BE UNDERESTIMATED. IT'S BEEN

USED

8 THROUGHOUT THE BOARD. WE'RE USING IT IN TERMS

OF

9 OUR WORK ON THE STRATEGIC PLAN AND OUR

STRATEGY

10 DEVELOPMENT TOO, SO I THINK ITS IMPORTANCE CAN'T

BE

- 11 UNDERESTIMATED.
- BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: THE THREE TIED
- 13 TOGETHER, THESE PIECES TIED TOGETHER REALLY
- 14 CRYSTALLIZE OUR LOCAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM AND

BEGIN

15 TO REALLY MAKE IT MUCH MORE CONCRETE AND, AS I

SAID

- 16 EARLIER, ACCESSIBLE, AND I THINK IT'S A GREAT LEAP
- 17 FORWARD.
- 18 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: GOOD. THANK YOU.
- 19 OKAY. WE'LL MOVE TO ITEM ADDENDUM 1, WHICH IS
- 20 CONSIDERATION OF A POLICY THAT WILL ESTABLISH
- 21 CRITERIA TO DETERMINE WHEN AND UNDER WHAT
- 22 CIRCUMSTANCES AN APPLICANT FOR A BOARD CONTRACT,
- 23 GRANT, LOAN SHOULD BE CONSIDERED UNRELIABLE AND
- 24 THEREFORE NOT AWARDED A CONTRACT, GRANT, OR LOAN.
- MR. RICK BEARD.

- 1 MR. BEARD: MR. CHAIRMAN, MEMBERS OF THE
- 2 BOARD, I'M RICK BEARD, FISCAL MANAGER FOR THE BOARD
- 3 HERE. AND THE ITEM BEFORE YOU THAT WE'RE BRINGING
- 4 IS FROM POLICY COMMITTEE. IT WAS TAKEN TO POLICY
- 5 IN AUGUST, AND THEN WE WERE ASKED TO COME BACK.
- 6 WAS A BROAD POLICY THAT WE WERE TRYING TO WORK
 ON
- 7 AT FIRST. WE BROUGHT IT BACK THIS MONTH, AND NOW
 - 8 IT'S GOING BEFORE THE BOARD.
 - 9 THE POLICY RECOMMENDS ADOPTION OF

ΑN

- 10 INTERNAL BOARD POLICY THAT WILL HAVE ESTABLISHED
- 11 CRITERIA FOR DETERMINING WHEN AND UNDER WHAT
- 12 CIRCUMSTANCES AN APPLICANT WHO WOULD APPLY FOR

Α

BOARD CONTRACT OR GRANT OR APPROVAL OF LOAN SHOULD

14	BE CONSIDERED UNRELIABLE AND THEREFORE NOT
AWARDE	D
15	THE GRANT OR CONTRACT OR APPROVED FOR A LOAN.
16	THE CRITERIA THAT HAS BEEN
DEVELO	PED
17	HAS BEEN REWORKED SEVERAL TIMES, AND I THINK
THE	
18	POLICY CHAIRMAN, MR. JONES, ALLUDED TO THAT
EARLIE	R
19	IN THE DAY, THAT BETWEEN THE TIME THAT THE ITEM
WAS	
20	PASSED FORWARD FROM THE COMMITTEE TO THE BOARD,
WE	
21	HAVE HAD SOME REFINEMENT IN IT, AND I BELIEVE
22	EVERYBODY HAS THE NEW WORDING THAT WE PUT IN.
23	BOARD MEMBER RELIS: THAT'S NOVEMBER
19TH	
24	THAT'S ATTACHED?
25	MR. BEARD: YES, MR. RELIS. 209

- 1 THE CRITERIA IS IN THE ATTACHMENT,
- 2 AND THE POLICY, IN A NUTSHELL, LISTS FINDINGS

THAT

- 3 CAN BE -- TAKE PLACE FROM LOANS, GRANTS, CONTRACTS,
- 4 WHAT HAVE YOU; AND IF THOSE FINDINGS WERE FOUND
- 5 BOARD STAFF, THEN THEY WOULD BE PUSHED UP THE
- 6 LADDER TO THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, WHO WOULD HAVE
- 7 THE ABILITY TO DETERMINE THAT, YES, INDEED THIS
- 8 ENTITY OR PERSON WAS DEEMED UNRELIABLE BECAUSE

OF

ΒY

9 THESE FINDINGS AND POTENTIALLY PLACED ON A LIST

OR

- 10 WHAT HAVE YOU AND BE INELIGIBLE TO RECEIVE A
- 11 CONTRACT OR GRANT OR TO BE APPROVED FOR A LOAN

FOR

- 12 THREE YEARS.
- 13 WHEN THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

RECEIVES

14 THE FINDINGS AND THE RECOMMENDATION FROM STAFF,

THE

15 ENTITY OR PERSON WOULD BE CONTACTED AND HAVE A

16	60-DAY PERIOD TO REBUT OR REFUTE ANY FINDINGS
THAT	
17	WERE MADE TO KIND OF PLEAD THEIR CASE.
18	THE STAFF RECOMMEND THAT THE
19	RESOLUTION 97-356 BE APPROVED, WHICH WOULD ADOPT
20	THIS POLICY THAT'S WITHIN THIS ITEM HERE. AND
LIZ	
21	CLAYTON OF THE LEGAL STAFF AND MYSELF ARE HERE
TO	
22	ANSWER ANY QUESTIONS.
23	CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: OKAY. MR.
CHESBRO).
24	BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: MY QUESTION
WOULD	
25	BE IS THIS LIKE A, YOU KNOW, SCARLET LETTER FOR 210

LIFE, OR IS THERE, LIKE, SOME WAY BUSINESS OR AN 1 2 INDIVIDUAL EVER COMES OFF THE LIST? 3 MR. BEARD: THE WAY THE POLICY IS WRITTEN, THERE WOULD BE A THREE-YEAR TIME FRAME IF YOU WERE 5 INDEED PUT ON THIS LIST FROM THE TIME THE CONTRACT 6 WAS ENDED OR GRANT OR LOAN. 7 BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: THANKS. 8 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: ANY OTHER 9 DISCUSSION? 10 BOARD MEMBER FRAZEE: YES. 11 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: YES, MR. FRAZEE. 12 BOARD MEMBER FRAZEE: LOOKING AT THE13 PROPOSED LANGUAGE, THE BOARD SHALL NOT AWARD Α 14 CONTRACT OR GRANT OR APPROVE A LOAN, ONE OF THE CONCERNS I'VE ALWAYS HAD IN THIS KIND OF A 15 16 PROCEDURE IS LETTING THE PERSON APPLY IN THE 17 BEGINNING. IT'S MY BELIEF THAT THE

DISQUALIFICA-

18 TION SHOULD COME AT THE APPLICATION LEVEL RATHER 19 THAN SOMEWHERE DOWN THE LINE. HOW DO WE STAND ON20 THAT? 21 MS. CLAYTON: WE DID LOOK INTO THAT ISSUE, 22 AND WITH OR WITHOUT THE POLICY, WE NEED TO BE ABLE TO LET THE APPLICANT FOR A CONTRACT, GRANT, OR LOAN APPLY, AND THEN WE CAN USE THE GROUNDS IN THE 24 25 POLICY OR ANY OTHER GROUNDS, ANY OTHER CRITERIA 211

- 1 THAT WE WOULD NORMALLY USE TO EITHER ACCEPT OR
- 2 REJECT THAT APPLICATION. BY LAW WE DO NEED TO AT
- 3 LEAST ACCEPT IT.
- 4 MR. BEARD: SO IT WOULD BECOME PART OF

OUR

- 5 CRITERIA. YOU COULD APPLY, BUT THEN PART OF OUR
- 6 CRITERIA WOULD BE LOOKING AT THIS PARTICULAR ISSUE.
 - 7 BOARD MEMBER FRAZEE: WHAT ABOUT IN THE
 - 8 CASE OF A COMPETITIVE BID? WOULD A PERSON BE
- 9 NOTIFIED OF THIS AND NOT ALLOWED TO BID, OR WOULD
- 10 THEY BE ON A LIST OF UNOUALIFIED BIDDERS BECAUSE

OF

- 11 THIS POLICY?
- 12 MS. CLAYTON: LET ME ANSWER YOUR FIRST
- 13 QUESTION FIRST. WE WOULD NEED TO DEVELOP
- 14 PROCEDURES ON HOW WE WOULD IMPLEMENT THE POLICY

ΙF

- 15 IT'S ADOPTED, BUT WE WOULD THINK THAT FUTURE
- 16 APPLICANTS FOR CONTRACTS, GRANTS, OR LOANS NEED

ТО

- 17 KNOW ABOUT THE EXISTENCE OF THE POLICY. SO WE
- 18 WOULD MAKE SURE THAT THERE'S A REFERENCE,

EITHER

19	FOR GRANTS, IT COULD EITHER BE IN THE NOFA OR
IN	
20	THE EVALUATION CRITERIA. FOR CONTRACTS, IT
COULD	
21	BE IN THE BID ADVERTISEMENT; AND FOR LOANS, IT
22	WOULD BE IN THE LOAN APPLICATION TO LET THEM
KNOW	
23	THAT THERE IS SUCH A POLICY AND MAKE SURE THAT
THEY	
24	KNOW IT'S AVAILABLE UPON REQUEST, SO THEY KNOW
WHAT	
25	THE GROUND RULES ARE BEFORE THEY APPLY. 212

AND THEN YOUR SECOND QUESTION WAS

1

10

THE

11

12

STILL

2 WOULD THEY GO ON THE LIST. AND, YES, THEY WOULD GO 3 ON THE LIST ONLY AFTER THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HAD MADE A PROPOSED FINDING, THE APPLICANT HAS HAD Α 5 CHANCE TO APPEAL, AND THE BOARD HAS HEARD THE APPEAL, AND THE BOARD HAS DECIDED TO CONFIRM THE 7 FINDING OF UNRELIABILITY, THEN THEIR NAME WOULD GO ON THE LIST, AND THEIR NAME WOULD BE ON THAT LIST 9 FOR THREE YEARS.

- 13 HAS THE ABILITY TO BID OR TO PUT IN AN APPLICATION,
- 14 AND IN THAT SITUATION PUTTING AN ERRONEOUS BID

POTENTIAL FOR SOME MISCHIEF TO BE CONDUCTED BY

SOMEONE WHO KNOWS THEY'RE ON THIS LIST, BUT

BOARD MEMBER FRAZEE: THERE'S ALWAYS

TΝ	_	
1 1/1	т	TТ
		1/1

JUST TO STIR UP THE POT A BIT, IF YOU WILL, AND

SO

16 THAT'S THE REASON FOR MY QUESTION. IT SEEMS

THAT

- 17 THERE SHOULD BE SOME WAY TO DISQUALIFY PEOPLE IN
- 18 ADVANCE OF THEIR ACTUALLY SUBMITTING A BID OR
- 19 CONTRACT APPLICATION.
- 20 MS. CLAYTON: IN THEORY THEY SHOULD

BE

- 21 DISQUALIFIED. IF THEY KNOW THEY'RE ON THE LIST,
- 22 THEY SHOULDN'T BE APPLYING. IF THEY DID APPLY, WE
- 23 WOULD SIMPLY NOTIFY THEM THAT THEY'RE NOT ELIGIBLE.
- 24 BOARD MEMBER FRAZEE: SO THIS LIST WILL BE
- 25 INDEPENDENT OF ANY BIDS OR PROPOSALS FOR CONTRACTS

1	THAT WILL BE DEVELOPED OVER TIME AND ADDED TO
AND	
2	WILL BE PUBLIC INFORMATION?
3	MS. CLAYTON: RIGHT.
4	CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: ADDED TO AND
5	DELETED.
6	MR. BEARD: AND ONE COULD SURMISE THAT
IF	
7	SOMEBODY KNEW THEY WERE ON THIS LIST, WOULDN'T
GO	
8	TO THE TROUBLE OR DOLLAR EFFORT TO SUBMIT A
9	CONTRACT BECAUSE I UNDERSTAND THAT'S A PRETTY
10	INTENSIVE PROCESS.
11	MS. TOBIAS: MR. FRAZEE, I DON'T KNOW
IF	
12	THIS HELPS OR NOT, AND, LIZ, CERTAINLY CORRECT
ME	
13	IF I'M WRONG, BUT ON PAGE 3 WHERE IT TALKS
ABOUT	
14	BIDDING CONTRACTS, THE PUBLIC CONTRACTS CODE
15	ALREADY TALKS ABOUT THE CIRCUMSTANCES UNDER
WHICH	A
16	PERSON IS PROHIBITED FROM BIDDING. SO WE CAN'T
17	BASICALLY COME INTO THAT AND COME UP WITH

OTHER

- 18 CRITERIA OR POLICY BECAUSE BASICALLY THE STATE'S
- 19 ALREADY ACTED ON THAT.
- 20 SO THE AVENUE THAT WE CHOSE TO

PURSUE

- 21 HERE WAS TO MOVE TO THE CRITERIA ON WHICH TO AWARD
- 22 A BID. SO THAT'S THE DISTINCTION. WE STARTED WITH
- THE IDEA THAT, OF COURSE, IT WOULD BE BETTER TO
- 24 TELL SOMEBODY RIGHT UP FRONT THAT THEY WOULD NOT

BE

ABLE TO EVEN BID ON A CONTRACT, BUT WE COULDN'T

DO

- 1 THAT BECAUSE OF THE EXISTING LANGUAGE IN THE CODE.
 - 2 DOES THAT HELP?
 - BOARD MEMBER FRAZEE: OKAY. YES.
 - 4 BOARD MEMBER RELIS: MR. CHAIR, I JUST
 - 5 WANT TO MAKE SURE I UNDERSTAND IT. I THINK

ΙT

- 6 CAPTURES WHAT I WAS AFTER. OKAY. NO. 1
 SAYS
- 7 BASICALLY, AND A, B, C, D UNDER 1 ARE WHO'S SUBJECT
 - 8 TO THIS. AND THEN AT THE END -- AND THEN AT THE
- 9 END OF EACH OF THE A'S, B'S, C'S, D'S, THERE'S
- 10 REFERENCE TO UNRELIABLE, AND UNRELIABLE IS DEFINED
- 11 IN SECTION 2.
- MS. CLAYTON: THAT'S RIGHT.
- BOARD MEMBER RELIS: SO NO. 1, OKAY,

OHW

WOULD FALL UNDER THESE CATEGORIES? I LOOK TO

THE

- 15 FIRST PAGE. THEN I DEFINE UNRELIABILITY, AND THAT
- 16 HAS TO BE ONE OF THE A TO G. THAT'S THE SOLE

17	DEFINITION. WE CAN'T GO OUTSIDE THOSE BOUNDS.
18	MS. CLAYTON: THAT'S RIGHT.
19	BOARD MEMBER RELIS: AND THEN 3 AND
4, 3	
20	ADDRESSES THAT BASICALLY IF WE MADE A
CONTRA	CT,
21	THEN WE CAN THEN UNRELIABILITY APPLIES, CAN
22	APPLY AT THAT POINT.
23	MS. CLAYTON: THAT'S RIGHT.
24	BOARD MEMBER RELIS: IF A THROUGH G ARE
25	INFRINGED ON. AND 4 IS, LET'S SEE, OH, THAT'S
THE	

215

- 1 HOW WE DISCLOSE THIS, HOW WE OFFER THE INFORMATION
- 2 TO A PARTY THAT'S DISQUALIFIED, AND WHAT THE APPEAL
 - 3 PROCESS IS. IS THAT A FAIR?
 - 4 MS. CLAYTON: THAT'S EXACTLY IT.
 - 5 BOARD MEMBER RELIS: I JUST WANTED TO

MAKE

- 6 SURE I UNDERSTOOD HOW IT WOULD WORK.
- 7 BOARD MEMBER FRAZEE: ASK ANOTHER
- 8 QUESTION. UNDER G, CURRENTLY IN VIOLATION OF

ANY

- 9 BOARD STATUTE OR REGULATION, WOULD THAT OR COULD
- 10 THAT BE CONSTRUED TO APPLY TO, SAY, A GAS

VIOLATION

- 11 AT A LANDFILL?
- MS. CLAYTON: YES, IT COULD. IT COULD

BE

13 ANY VIOLATION OF BOARD STATUTES OR REGULATIONS,

AND

- 14 THE POLICY WOULD APPLY UNLESS THE MONEY THAT
- 15 THEY'RE SEEKING FROM THE BOARD, THE PURPOSE OF

THAT

- 16 IS TO REMEDIATE THE VIOLATION.
- 17 BOARD MEMBER FRAZEE: SO EVEN SOMETHING

AS

- 18 MINOR AS A LITTER VIOLATION AT A LANDFILL COULD
- 19 POTENTIALLY TRIGGER THIS?
- 20 BOARD MEMBER JONES: MR. FRAZEE, IN
- 21 COMMITTEE WE HAD THAT DISCUSSION BECAUSE WE

DIDN'T

- 22 WANT THOSE PEOPLE THAT HAD A LITTER VIOLATION OR
- 23 SOMETHING TO BE TAKEN CARE OF, AND THAT'S WHY

IT IS

- 24 THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR MAY MAKE A FINDING ABOVE IT.
- 25 IT IS -- SO COMMON SENSE PREVAILS. 216

- 1 I HAVE A LETTER -- I ASKED
- JEANNINE
- 2 TO GET IT TO ALL THE BOARD MEMBERS. I DON'T KNOW
- 3 IF SHE DID -- FROM MR. ERIC SUNSWHEAT, WHO HAD
- 4 SUGGESTION OF WHAT WE COULD ADD TO THIS.

EVERYBODY

- 5 IS LAUGHING, SO I GUESS THEY READ IT. I'M NOT
- 6 PROPOSING THIS LANGUAGE, BUT IT WAS THAT --

HIS

- 7 PROPOSED LANGUAGE WAS THAT ANY WASTE BOARD BOARD
- 8 MEMBER SERVING A CURRENT TERM IS TO BE CONSIDERED
- 9 AS A CONTRACTOR WITH A BOARD CONTRACT. A BOARD
- 10 MEMBER CONFIRMED BY THE STATE LEGISLATURE FOR A NEW
- 11 TERM IS TO BE CONSIDERED AS PENDING APPLICANT FOR A
- 12 BOARD CONTRACT. AND FOR THE PURPOSES OF
- JURISDICTIONAL AUTHORITY SCOPE IN THIS DOCUMENT,
- 14 BOARD MEMBERS REQUIRED TO MEET THE CRITERIA AS

OF	
15	ANY APPLICANT IN MIND. AND FINDING OR FAILURE
TO	
16	MEET THE CRITERIA IS GROUNDS TO PREVENT
17	CONTINUATION IN OFFICE, REQUIRES THE BOARD TO
18	CENSURE THE APPLICANT BOARD MEMBER, AND TO VOID
19	PENDING PAY CONTRACT.
20	I DON'T KNOW IF ANYBODY WANTS
THAT	
21	INCLUDED. I KNOW I THINK I'M THE ONLY ONE
THAT	
22	MIGHT HAVE A VIOLATION BECAUSE I OPERATED
23	FACILITIES WITHIN THE LAST THREE YEARS. I
HOPE Y	OU
24	GUYS DON'T WANT TO PUT IT ON. IT'S SCARY.
25	I'LL MAKE A 217

1 BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: I JUST -- I

WAS

- 2 GOING TO SAY I NOTE THAT IT AFFECTS CONTRACTS,
- 3 GRANTS, AND LOANS, BUT NOT SOLID WASTE FACILITY
- 4 PERMITS, I PRESUME. THERE'S NO REQUIREMENT THAT
- 5 WE'RE GOING TO PUT THIS CRITERIA ON AN OPERATOR.
- 6 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: OKAY. ANY OTHER
- 7 DISCUSSION?
- 8 BOARD MEMBER JONES: MR. CHAIRMAN,

Ι'D

- 9 LIKE TO MAKE A MOTION THAT WE MOVE RESOLUTION
- 10 97-356.
- 11 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: DO WE HAVE A

SECOND?

- 12 BOARD MEMBER GOTCH: I'LL SECOND.
- 13 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: OKAY. IT'S BEEN
- 14 MOVED AND SECONDED. IF THERE'S NO FURTHER
- 15 DISCUSSION, WILL THE SECRETARY CALL THE ROLL.

16	THE SECRETARY: BOA	ARD MEMBER
CHESBRO.		
17	BOARD MEMBER CHESBE	RO: AYE.
18	THE SECRETARY: FRA	AZEE.
19	BOARD MEMBER FRAZEE	: AYE.
20	THE SECRETARY: GOT	CH.
21	BOARD MEMBER GOTCH:	AYE.
22	THE SECRETARY: JON	IES.
23	BOARD MEMBER JONES:	AYE.
24	THE SECRETARY: REI	JIS.
25	BOARD MEMBER RELIS: 218	AYE.

1 THE SECRETARY: CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON. 2 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: AYE. MOTION 3 CARRIES. 4 WE NOW MOVE TO OPEN DISCUSSION, AND I DO HAVE TWO PEOPLE WHO WISH TO ADDRESS US THIS 6 AFTERNOON IN THE OPEN DISCUSSION. FIRST BEING JOE 7 MINNER. 8 MR. MINNER: DO A LITTLE CHANGING IN EQUIPMENT HERE SO THAT I CAN USE THE PODIUM. 9 GOOD 10 AFTERNOON. MY NAME IS JOE MINNER. AND FOR THE NEXT COUPLE OF WEEKS, I'M THE DIRECTOR FOR THE 11 12 DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES AT THE COUNTY OF SAN 13 DIEGO. AND I'M HERE THIS AFTERNOON TO PROVIDE YOU 14 A BRIEF UPDATE. I PROMISE IT WILL BE BRIEF AS IT

15 RELATES TO OUR DIVESTITURE PROCESS IN SAN DIEGO 16 COUNTY. APPRECIATE THIS OPPORTUNITY, MR. CHAIRMAN 17 AND MEMBERS OF THE BOARD. 18 BEFORE WE DECIDED TO SELL THE LANDFILL SYSTEM, WE LOOKED AT SEVERAL FACTORS, 19 ONE OF WHICH WAS OUR INACTIVE SITES, AND WE LOOKED ΑT 21 OUR OBJECTIVES UNDER A POSSIBLE DIVESTITURE OR SALE OF THE SYSTEM. AND ONE OF THOSE WAS TO REDUCE THE 23 RISK OR THE EXPOSURE TO OUR GENERAL FUND FROM THESE 24 RETAINED SITES. IN SAN DIEGO COUNTY WE HAVE A 25 LITTLE OVER A DOZEN INACTIVE LANDFILL SITES, A

219

- 1 COUPLE OF BURN SITES, AND THEN AS PART OF THE SALE,
 - 2 WE RETAINED THE CLASS I SITE AT OTAI LANDFILL.
 - 3 AND IN LOOKING AT THESE SITES, WE
 - 4 LOOKED AT THE ABILITY TO FUND THE FUTURE
- 5 LIABILITIES THAT WERE REPRESENTED UNDER A

SCENARIO

- 6 THAT THE COMPANY MAKING AN OFFER ON THE ACTIVE
- 7 LANDFILLS WOULD NOT WANT TO PICK UP THE INACTIVE
- 8 LANDFILLS ALSO. SO WE LOOKED -- UNDER THAT
- 9 SCENARIO, WE LOOKED AT TWO OPTIONS. THE FIRST

WAS

- 10 TO OPERATE THE SYSTEM FOR, SAY, A PERIOD OF 30
- 11 YEARS OR LONGER, AND THE OTHER ONE WAS TO SELL

THE

- 12 SYSTEM AND THEN CREATE AN ENVIRONMENTAL TRUST
- 13 FUND.
- 14 LOOKING AT THOSE TWO OPTIONS, WE
- 15 VIEWED THE FIRST OPTION AS THAT BEING ONE THAT
- 16 REPRESENTED A HIGH RISK TO THE COUNTY COMPETING

IN

- 17 A VERY COMPETITIVE MARKET IN SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA,
- 18 THE OTHER CHALLENGES THAT THE COUNTY WAS

COULD

VERSUS THE SECOND OPTION, WHICH WE VIEWED NOT

JUST

20 AS LOW RISK, BUT A NO RISK IF WE WERE, INDEED,

21 SUCCESSFUL AT BEING ABLE TO SELL THE SYSTEM FOR

22 APPROPRIATE AMOUNT OF MONEY.

23 LOOKED AT ANOTHER WAY OVER THAT

24 30-YEAR PERIOD OF TIME, WE COULD, WITH TIPPING

FEES

25 BEING REPRESENTED ON THE LEFT-HAND AXIS, WE

220

1	SET TIPPING FEES OVER A 30-YEAR PERIOD OF TIME
ТО	
2	COVER OUR ACTIVE LANDFILL COST, AND THEN HOPE
IN A	
3	VERY COMPETITIVE MARKET TO KEEP THE RATES HIGH
4	ENOUGH TO BE ABLE TO PROVIDE THAT MARGIN FOR

- 5 INACTIVE SITES. OR THE OTHER OPTION WAS TO BE ABLE
 - 6 TO SELL THE SYSTEM FOR AN APPROPRIATE AMOUNT OF
- 7 MONEY AND CREATE AN ENVIRONMENTAL TRUST FUND
- 8 WAS FULLY FUNDED NOW.
- 9 AND INDEED I'M VERY PLEASED TO REPORT
- 10 THAT WE WERE ABLE TO SUCCESSFULLY SELL THE SYSTEM
- 11 TO ALLIED WASTE. THE DOLLAR AMOUNT IN CASH BY
- 12 ALLIED WAS \$163 MILLION. WE ALSO, IN WORKING
- 13 YOUR STAFF, RECEIVED THE RELEASE OF THE CLOSURE
- 14 FUNDS ON THE ACTIVE LANDFILLS THAT ARE

TRANSFERRED

WITH

THE

THAT

15	$T \cap$	AT.T.TED	TNT	THE	AMOUNT	\bigcirc F	TROMIA	16	ΔMD	ТИИТ
1 J	10	AUUIUU	T 1/1	T 1115	AMOUNT	OT.	ALIMOSI	ΤΟ,	AND	TIIT

- 16 CONSTITUTED THE SUCCESSFUL SALE OF OUR SYSTEM.
- 17 ONE OF THE THINGS THAT OUR BOARD

DID

- 18 THEN REGARDING THE INACTIVE SITES WAS ON NOVEMBER
- 19 THE 4TH BY ORDINANCE, OUR BOARD CREATED AN
- 20 ENVIRONMENTAL TRUST FUND; AND IN DETERMINING

THAT

- 21 AMOUNT, WE LOOKED AT SEVERAL THINGS. WE COMPLETED
- TWO SEPARATE ENGINEERING ANALYSES. THEY LOOKED

 AT

- 23 A 30-YEAR MAINTENANCE SCENARIO FOR THE INACTIVE
- 24 SITES THAT WE MAINTAINED OWNERSHIP OF. WE

LOOKED

25 AT DOING ADDITIONAL CLOSURE WORK IF THAT WOULD

LEND

- 1 ITSELF TO THOSE SITES, AND WE LOOKED AT POTENTIAL
 - 2 CORRECTIVE ACTION PROGRAMS.
- THESE ANALYSES THEN LED TO A RANGE

OF

- 4 RISK FROM 75 MILLION TO A \$140 MILLION NET PRESENT
- 5 VALUE IN TERMS OF CALCULATION. AND THE AMOUNT THAT
- 6 WE RECOMMENDED AND THE AMOUNT THAT OUR BOARD
- 7 APPROVED THEN WAS WHAT WE BELIEVED WAS A PRUDENT
- 8 LEVEL OF FUNDING, \$101 MILLION. THAT \$101

MILLION

- 9 THEN IS ROUGHLY THE 75 MILLION THAT'S REPRESENTED
- 10 IN MAINTENANCE COST LONG TERM FOR THOSE SITES WITH
- 11 AN ADDITIONAL 26 MILLION FOR POTENTIAL IMPROVEMENTS
- 12 AND CORRECTIVE ACTION PROGRAMS FOR THOSE LANDFILLS.
- NOW THAT WE HAVE THE MONEY, WHAT ARE
- 14 WE GOING TO DO WITH IT? WE WILL BE VERY

Α	G	GR	\mathbf{E}	S	S	T	V	E

- 15 IN LOOKING AT THE SITES THAT WE DO MAINTAIN THE
- 16 RESPONSIBILITY FOR. WE'LL BE LOOKING AT WAYS TO
- 17 MINIMIZE OUR RISK, TO POSSIBLY REUSE THOSE SITES,
- 18 AND FOR THOSE THAT WE MIGHT BE ABLE TO DO SOMETHING
- 19 LIKE CLEAN CLOSURE, POSSIBLY EVEN SELL SOME OF
- 20 THOSE SITES. AND THEN WE'LL ALSO BE PRUDENT
- 21 KEEPERS OF THE FUND.
- 22 WE'LL BE LOOKING AT DEVELOPING

SOME

- 23 MULTI-YEAR IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS SO THAT THEN WE
- CAN
- 24 MAINTAIN THE -- AS MUCH CASH AVAILABLE IN
- 25 APPROPRIATE INVESTMENTS OVER THE LONG TERM.

1	I APPRECIATE YOUR PATIENCE. I
HOPE	
2	THAT WE'VE BEEN ABLE TO END YOUR DAY ON A
POSIT	IVE
3	NOTE HERE. AND I WOULD LOOK FORWARD TO
ANSWE	RING
4	ANY QUESTIONS THAT ANY BOARD MEMBERS MAY HAVE.
5	BOARD MEMBER FRAZEE: HOW DOES THE
CURREI	NT
6	CLOSURE FUND FOR THE SAN MARCOS LANDFILL FIT
INTO	
7	THIS? IS IT PART OF THIS? IS IT PART OF THE
15	
8	MILLION, OR IS IT STILL SITTING THERE?
9	MR. MINNER: EXCELLENT QUESTION. IT
IS	
10	STILL SITTING THERE.
11	BOARD MEMBER FRAZEE: SO IT WOULD BE
12	AVAILABLE IN ADDITION TO THIS MONEY?
13	MR. MINNER: THAT'S CORRECT. THE
CLOSUE	RE
14	WAS NOT PART OF THE \$101 MILLION, AND ITS VALUE
15	RIGHT NOW IS APPROXIMATELY \$16 MILLION, AND
THAT	

16 WILL BE MADE AVAILABLE -- AND THAT 16 --17 COINCIDENCE, IT'S 16 ABOVE AND BEYOND THE 16.2 THAT18 WAS RELEASED, AND THAT'S AVAILABLE FOR FORMAL 19 CLOSURE ONCE WE ARE ABLE TO RECEIVE FINAL APPROVAL OF THAT CLOSURE PLAN, AND WE'RE GOING THROUGH THE21 SUPPLEMENTAL EIR PROCESS RIGHT NOW. 22 BOARD MEMBER FRAZEE: ARE THERE ANY OTHER SITES THAT ARE SIMILARLY SITUATED THAT STILL 23 HAVE 24 CLOSURE WORK TO BE DONE AND HAVE A FUND? 25 MR. MINNER: NOT ANY OTHER SITES THAT

223

HAVE

1 A FORMAL CLOSURE FUND. THEY ALL STOPPED RECEIVING 2 WASTE BEFORE THE MID-1980 TIME FRAME. 3 BOARD MEMBER FRAZEE: THANK YOU. 4 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: ANY OTHER QUESTIONS? 5 BOARD MEMBER RELIS: IT'S TOO LATE IN THE 6 DAY. 7 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: OKAY. THANK YOU 8 VERY MUCH. APPRECIATE IT. NICE WORK. 9 NOW WE HAVE MR. EVAN EDGAR. 10 MR. EDGAR: STILL GOT TWO MORE MINUTES. 11 EVAN EDGAR REPRESENTING THE CALIFORNIA REFUSE 12 REMOVAL COUNCIL. I'M HERE TODAY BECAUSE I CAN'T BE 13 HERE TOMORROW. I HAVE THE GARBAGE GUYS COMING INTO 14 TOWN ON A STATE EXECUTIVE MEETING, AND I WANTED TO 15 MAKE SURE THAT YOU KNOW THAT WE ARE VERY

SUPPORTIVE

16	OF THE STRATEGIC PLAN AND THE MESSAGE YOU GUYS
ARE	
17	SENDING ABOUT YOUR FOCUS AND THE CORE BUSINESS
18	PRACTICES YOU GUYS ARE EMBARKING UPON OVER THE
NEXT	
19	FEW YEARS.
20	I THINK THE PUTTING ORGANICS
FIRST	
21	WAS A KEY ISSUE THAT WE'VE BEEN VERY SUPPORTIVE
OF	
22	ON ORGANICS, AND WE PUT A LOT OF EFFORT INTO
THAT,	
23	SO WE'RE HIGHLY SUPPORTIVE OF PUTTING ORGANICS
24	FIRST.
25	NO. 2 ON C&D DIVERSION, THAT'S A
HUGE	
	224

- 1 TARGET. THIS MIRRORS THE 1996 MARKET DEVELOPMENT
- 2 PLAN WITH PRIORITY MATERIALS, WHICH WE WERE HIGHLY
 - 3 SUPPORTIVE OF.
 - 4 NO. 3 WAS IMPROVING FACILITY
 - 5 COMPLIANCE. THAT IS NEEDED, NOT ONLY FROM
- 6 REGULATORY EQUITY, BUT ENFORCEMENT EQUITY. THE
- BIG
- 7 YEAR OF ENFORCEMENT THAT WAS GOING TO HAPPEN BACK
- 8 IN 1996 WITH AB 59 DIDN'T HAPPEN, BUT MAYBE THAT
- 9 WILL HAPPEN IN THE FUTURE AS WE IMPROVE OUR
- 10 FACILITY COMPLIANCE BOTH FOR LANDFILLS AND FOR
- 11 DIVERSION FACILITIES.
- 12 AND THE FOURTH ONE IS PARAMOUNT.

WE

- 13 MET -- WE HAD A MEETING TODAY WITH CRRC, AND WE
- 14 LAUDED THE WASTE BOARD ON THEIR IMPROVING

LOCAL

DIVERSION

- 15 GOVERNMENT PERFORMANCE IN THE AB 939
- 16 MANDATE. THAT'S SO CRITICAL, LOOKING AT THE

- 17 NUMBERS, HOW THE JURISDICTIONS ARE COMPLYING AND
- 18 THE NUMBERS OF PLANS ARE COMING IN, AND ENFORCEMENT
- 19 ACTIONS COULD BE COMING UP, WE THINK THEY'RE MAKING
- 20 GREAT EFFORTS THERE, AND WE HIGHLY CONCUR WITH THAT
- NO. 4 ITEM THERE.
- 22 SO SINCE I'M NOT HERE TOMORROW, WE DO
- 23 CARE. I'M NOT SILENT BECAUSE I COULDN'T BE HERE
- 24 TOMORROW. ONE LAST NOTE ABOUT THE C&D IS WE HAVE
- 25 THE SAME CONCERNS THAT WERE VOICED FROM MR. CHESBRO

- 1 ABOUT USING THE MINE RECLAMATION AS OPEN DUMPS.
- 2 JUST LOOKING AT THE PAGE 31-14 OF THE STRATEGIC
 - 3 PLAN, IT SHOWS A LITTLE PIE CHART ABOUT C&D
 - 4 COMPONENTS. THIRTY-ONE PERCENT OF THE C&D
 - 5 COMPONENTS ARE INERT; 25 PERCENT ARE WOOD; 9
 - 6 PERCENT ARE METALS, CARDBOARD, CARPET, AND
 - 7 PLASTICS; THE OTHER 35 PERCENT IS OTHER. THAT
 - 8 COULD BE ASBESTOS, DRYWALL, WHO KNOWS.
 - 9 SO I THINK WHEN IT COMES DOWN TO

THE

10 C&D AUTHORITY, I THINK IT REALLY WILL COME DOWN

TO

11 DEFINITIONS; WHEREAS, FOR INERT MATERIAL, THE

MINE

12 RECLAMATION PEOPLE MAY HAVE A CASE. BUT WHEN

YOU

13 LOOK AT THE GLOBAL DEFINITION OF C&D, WE'RE

GOING

14 TO BE LOOKING AT IT VERY CLOSELY IN ORDER TO

DEFINE

15	THAT BECAUSE IT'S TOO WIDE OPEN IN ORDER TO
CREATE	
16	OPEN DUMPS OUT OF MINE REC SITES.
17	THANK YOU FOR THE OPPORTUNITY TO
18	SPEAK TODAY. AND WE'RE HIGHLY SUPPORTIVE OF
YOUR	
19	PLAN.
20	CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: ANY QUESTIONS OF
MR.	
21	EVAN EDGAR?
22	BOARD MEMBER JONES: MR. CHAIRMAN, I DO
23	HAVE A QUESTION UNDER OPEN DISCUSSION. DURING
THE	
24	ITEM 25, MR. FRAZEE HAD MADE A COMMENT THAT WHEN
HE	
25	FIRST GOT HERE, HE HAD A PROBLEM WITH THE EASE
IN	226

- 1 WHICH DEDESIGNATION OCCURS OR THAT MAYBE WE NEEDED
 - 2 TO FIX THAT. I'M JUST WONDERING IF IT'S ALSO ON
- 3 OTHER PEOPLE'S RADAR SCREENS THAT WE HAVE

OVERSIGHT

- 4 AND CERTIFICATION. WE DON'T HAVE OVERSIGHT IN
- 5 DECERTIFICATION. AND I THINK WE NEED TO ASK THE
- 6 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR AND PEOPLE TO LOOK AT THAT

AND

- 7 TO SEE IF WE NEED SOME LEGISLATIVE FIX ON THE
- 8 BUYING AND SELLING OF LEA'S FOR OUR OWN PURPOSES.
- 9 AND I'M JUST WONDERING IF

ANYBODY

10 ELSE SHARES THAT VIEW, OR IF ANYBODY WOULD

MIND

11 SUPPORTING ME IN HAVING THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

LOOK

12 AT A LEGISLATIVE FIX OF THE DEDESIGNATION WHERE

WE

- 13 HAVE SOME CRITERIA OR SOMETHING.
- 14 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: I'LL SUPPORT OR
- 15 SOMETHING.

16 BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: THEORETICALLY IT 17 MAKES A LOT OF SENSE, BUT IT'S A REAL CAN OF WORMS IN TERMS OF, YOU KNOW, WHICH WAY IT PLAYS IN 18 WHICH 19 COMMUNITY AND WHO'S GOING TO BE -- YOU KNOW, WHICH 20 SIDE. I MEAN IT'S CERTAINLY WORTH TALKING ABOUT, 21 BUT MY OPTIMISM ABOUT THE LEGISLATURE BEING ABLE ТО 22 GET THEIR ARMS AROUND IT IS NOT HIGH BECAUSE 23 IT'S -- IT JUST DEPENDS ON WHOSE OX IS GETTING GORED, YOU KNOW, WHERE PEOPLE COME OUT. 24 25 BOARD MEMBER JONES: I MEAN I'M AWARE

227

THAT

1 IT WAS A GIVE-UP IN THE FORMULATION OF AB 939.

I

- 2 DON'T HAVE A PROBLEM WITH THAT, BUT I DON'T
- 3 UNDERSTAND HOW IF OUR REGS, IF THE CERTIFICATION

IS

- 4 JUST, YOU KNOW, FILL OUT SOME FORMS, I'M WONDER-
- 5 ING -- YOU KNOW, WE HAVE SOME JURISDICTION OVER
- 6 THAT. WE DON'T HAVE ANY JURISDICTION AS WHEN

ONE

7 BECOMES DECERTIFIED. TO ME THAT'S -- WE NEED TO

AT

8 LEAST LOOK AT, AND I'M JUST WONDERING IF WE CAN

ΑT

9 LEAST LOOK AT -- ASK THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TO

LOOK

- 10 AT SOME OF THESE THINGS AND BRING SOMETHING BACK
- 11 FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES, YOU KNOW.
- 12 I MEAN I DON'T UNDERSTAND HOW
- 13 SOMEBODY WRITES A LETTER SAYING THAT THESE GUYS
- 14 HAVE BEEN GREAT, BUT WE'RE GOING TO DECERTIFY

THEM.

- 15 I JUST -- THERE NEEDS TO BE A CRITERIA FOR
- 16 DECERTIFICATION, OTHERWISE IF YOU CAN BUY AND

S	\mathbf{E}	Τ.	T.
\sim	Ľ	ш	—

- 17 LEA'S, AS IS HAPPENING IN THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
- 18 WHY ARE WE DOING THIS? YOU KNOW, WHY ARE WE EVEN
- 19 DOING THIS?
- BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: YEAH, BUT YOU

ARE

- 21 TALKING ABOUT THE CITIES GIVING THE COUNTY THE
- 22 UPPER HAND AND THE AUTHORITY QUESTION, YOU

KNOW.

- 23 I MEAN THAT'S JUST VERY UNLIKELY TO HAPPEN.
- 24 BOARD MEMBER JONES: YOU KNOW, LEA'S

JOBS

25 ARE TO ENSURE THAT THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

OF

228

- 1 THE CITIZENS, NOT TO BE USED FOR POLITICAL PURPOSE.
- 2 BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: BUT THE CITIES

ARE

3 GOING TO SAY WE SHOULD HAVE THE RIGHT TO HAVE

THE

4 SAME AUTHORITY JUST BECAUSE WE CHOOSE TO HAVE

IT,

5 NOT BECAUSE THE COUNTY HASN'T DONE THEIR JOB,

JUST

- 6 BECAUSE WE CHOOSE TO HAVE.
- 7 BOARD MEMBER JONES: I DON'T HAVE A
- 8 PROBLEM WITH THAT, BUT THERE SHOULD BE SOME
- 9 CRITERIA, YOU KNOW, I THINK. I'D LIKE TO JUST

TALK

- 10 ABOUT IT.
- 11 BOARD MEMBER RELIS: MAYBE WE COULD

HAVE A

12 DISCUSSION. I MEAN WE DID -- WE HAVE HAD A

NUMBER

- 13 OF CASES WHERE WE, IN FACT, SUSPECT THIS. AND I
- 14 MEAN CONCERNS WERE RAISED. I MEAN WE HAVE

CASE

15 STUDIES OF THAT. I THINK WE MIGHT WANT TO

KICK	
16	THAT AROUND A BIT, BUT I DON'T KNOW THAT WE
17	COULD
18	BOARD MEMBER CHESBRO: WE'VE HAD
THE	
19	REVERSE TOO THOUGH WHERE THE OPERATOR WANTED US
TO	
20	GET IT AWAY FROM THE CITY BECAUSE AND GIVE
IT TO	
21	THE COUNTY BECAUSE THEY THOUGHT THE CITY WAS
BEING	
22	TOO TOUGH ON THEM, YOU KNOW. SO I MEAN THAT'S
WHAT	
23	I MEANT BY IT CUTS A LOT OF DIFFERENT WAYS,
24	DEPENDING ON THE SITUATION.
25	BOARD MEMBER JONES: TELL YOU THE
TRUTH,	I

- 1 DON'T CARE WHICH WAY IT CUTS. I JUST THINK THERE
- 2 NEEDS TO BE A CRITERIA BECAUSE, YOU KNOW, THE FACT
- 3 SOMEBODY WANTS TO USE IT AS A POLITICAL TOOL,
- 4 ME, DOESN'T LEND ITSELF TO US DOING OUR JOB.
 AND
 - 5 SO I'D LIKE TO JUST EXPLORE THAT.
- 6 CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: WELL, I THINK
- 7 CERTAINLY YOU SHOULD EXPLORE IT WITH STAFF AND

THE

- 8 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, AND THEN IF WE CAN HAVE
- 9 DISCUSSION AMONG THE ADVISORS AND SEE WHERE WE

GO.

- 10 BOARD MEMBER JONES: I LOVE IT.
- BOARD MEMBER RELIS: MR. CHAIR, UNDER

OPEN

12 DISCUSSION I WANTED TO JUST COMMENT -- I KNOW

EVAN

WON'T BE HERE TOMORROW, BUT I WANTED TO THANK

EVAN

14 FOR AND THE CRRC FOR THEIR WORK ON HELPING US

WITH			
15	THE MARKET DEVELOPMENT, IN/ PARTICULAR IN THE		
16	ORGANICS AREAS. I KNOW THAT MY STAFF HAS WORKED		
17	CLOSELY WITH EVAN, AND HE'S KEPT US ON BOARD AS		
FAR			
18	AS THE PROGRESS MADE WITH CCQC, WITH CORK, WITH		
19	THE HIS OWN CLIENT BASE, AND I THINK		
THEY'VE			
20	BEEN INSTRUMENTAL REALLY IN THE PROGRESS		
WE'VE			
21	MADE. SO I DIDN'T WANT THAT TO GO		
UNNOTICED.			
22	CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: THANK YOU.		
YOU			
23	ALWAYS THINK THAT EVAN IS INSTRUMENTAL. OKAY.		
WE			
24	NOW MOVE INTO AN EXECUTIVE SESSION TO TAKE UP A		
25	BOARD MEMBER JONES: TEN MINUTES? 230		

```
1
            CHAIRMAN PENNINGTON: IF YOU WISH.
TEN
2
      MINUTES. WE WILL -- AND WE WILL RECONVENE AT
9:30
3
      TOMORROW MORNING TO HEAR ITEM 31.
4
                   GOING INTO EXECUTIVE SESSION ON A
 5 PERSONNEL MATTER.
6
7
                   (MEETING WAS THEN RECESSED TO
CLOSED
8 SESSION AT 4 P.M. TO THEN RECONVENE AT 9:30
A.M.,
9
  THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 20, 1997.)
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
```